The Nation

FOUNDED 1865

Vol. CXI NEW YORK, SATURDAY, AUGUST 14, 1920 No. 2876

Contents

EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS 173
EDITORIALS:
The Railroad Rate Increase 176
The End of Versailles 177
Who Wouldn't Desert—for Paris? 177
The Critic and His Uses 178
WILL RUSSIA DRIVE THE BRITISH FROM ASIA? By Henry G. Alsberg 179
THE GREAT WOOLEN STRIKE. By George Soule 181
WHEN FARMERS TURN POLITICIANS. By Arthur Warner 183
CANTU IN BAJA CALIFORNIA. By Mary Austin 184
THE TRIAL OF THE COMMUNISTS. By Robert Morss Lovett 185
IN THE DRIFTWAY. By the Drifter 186
CORRESPONDENCE 187
BOOKS:
The Fruits of the Frontier. By C. V. D 189
One More Mr. Wilson. By J. A. Hobson 189
Far Away and Long Ago. By Ludwig Lewisohn 190
Books in Brief 191
Notes and News 193
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS SECTION 194

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, EDITOR

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

WILLIAM MACDONALD FREDA KIRCHWEY

ARTHUR WARNER LEWIS S. GANNETT

LUDWIG LEWISOHN

ERNEST H. GRUENING, MANAGING EDITOR

CARL VAN DOREN, LITERARY EDITOR

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—Five dollars per annum postpaid in the United States and Mexico; to Canada, $5.50, and to foreign countries of the Postal Union, $6.00.

THE NATION, 20 Vesey Street, New York City. Cable Adress: NATION, New York. Chicago Office: 1170 People's Gas Building. British Agents for Subscriptions and Advertising: Swathmore Press, Ltd., 72 Oxford St., London.

WILL Italy go to war or threaten war with the United States as the result of the murderous assault on its citizens in West Frankfort, Illinois? Presumably not. And yet it is apparent that an Italian's life and property are not safe in that region of the United States, that armed mobs —bandits we would call them in Mexico, Nicaragua, or Haiti—are slaughtering and torturing foreigners and defying or wholly wiping out the local civil government. Italy may protest and even demand an explanation and some recompense; the United States may, if it chooses, pay attention to such action. Italy has no power to protect its citizens in this country, nor has any nation that dares not provoke us. If the laws and the authorities and the decent impulses of the United States fail to protect aliens they will die as they have died in Illinois. Thus breaks down the theory that the flag of a nation affords some mystical protection for its citizens in foreign lands. It is a theory seldom if ever effective to protect life, but rather to secure subsequent redress—and even then it is not always invoked. The flag of the United States was not invoked to protect countless Americans in Mexico, because the idiosyncratic Wilsonian diplomacy ran counter to the accepted rules of the game. Nor did "Old Glory" save the life or seek recompense for the death of Paul DeMotte, the Socialist, killed by the German Reichswehr after the armistice; nor indeed for the other victims of German frightfulness before our entry into the war. But while the practice is as often as not abandoned, the principle persists, convenient instrument of imperialism the world over. Its formal relinquishment in favor of reliance on the administrations and laws of the several nations of this earth will mark a great forward step in their better relationship.

MISS HARRIET MAY MILLS is the first woman to be put up by either of the major parties for a State office in New York. It appears, however, that her recent designation as the "unofficial" nominee of the Democratic Party for Secretary of State was not the act of open-handed gallantry or of even-handed justice that it might seem. Two years ago the women were invited to agree upon a candidate to be placed upon the State ticket, but, as they were unable to do so, the nominations all went to men. According to the New York *Tribune*, a committee of five women was this year asked to make a unanimous recommendation, many of the men hoping that history would repeat itself. When a unanimous verdict was reached, some disappointed men were for ignoring it, until Governor Smith sent this ultimatum: "I am running for Governor and not any of you. And I want a woman on the ticket." O Man!

THE virtually complete breakdown of British civil government in Ireland, and the lengths to which Mr. Lloyd George and his associates are willing to go when British control is jeopardized, are clearly shown in the provisions of the new coercion bill which has just been framed. The bill virtually revives for Ireland the Defense of the Realm Act of 1914, most of whose provisions have been repealed so far as the rest of Great Britain is concerned, and empowers the Government to place the execution of the act and of the supplementary coercion bill in the hands of Dublin Castle. Under the coercion bill jury trial will be abolished, and trial by courts martial or other courts of summary jurisdiction will be substituted. Both civil and criminal cases are included within the scope of the bill, and the new system is to extend to offenses committed in the past as well as to any that may be committed in the future. The only saving features of the measure are the requirements that punishments inflicted by the courts martial in criminal cases are to be the same as are now provided by statute or by common law for such offenses; and that in trials of capital offenses one member of the court shall be a person who may be nominated by the Lord Chief Justice of England instead of by Dublin Castle. The imprisonment of convicted persons in any part of the United Kingdom is also authorized. In terms the bill applies to the whole of Ireland, but, of course, it will not be extended to Protestant Ulster. One may safely predict that this new application of the iron hand will merely make the name of Britain still more odious in Ireland and strengthen the resistance of Sinn Fein. We suggest that the only thing necessary to complete the program is for the British Government to request the extradition of Sinn Fein sympathizers in this country to be tried by courts martial in Ireland, and to send over more British secret service men to help Washington round them up.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE recognition by the United States of Julio de Costa as President of Costa Rica ends a disgraceful chapter in Wilsonian diplomacy. In 1917, the Costa Ricans, tired of the pro-German machinations of President Alfredo Gonzalez, demanded his resignation. For thirty-five years the political tranquillity of Costa Rica, most stable of Central American republics, had been undisturbed in its regular succession of duly elected chief executives. Nor was the revolt against Gonzalez the typical Latin-American revolution. Not a shot was fired, not a blow struck. A presidential election, promptly held, resulted in the choice, by a majority of twelve to one, of Federico Tinoco, minister of war and leader of the insurrection. Gonzalez, meantime, had reached Washington and obtained President Wilson's ear. A newly established principle was invoked, that of non-recognition of a government coming into power through revolution—a strange doctrine for the United States—which with Wilsonian consistency has not applied in the subsequent similar case of Peru. Non-recognition proving insufficient to carry out the proscription of Tinoco, our Administration went out of its way to isolate and bankrupt the tiny republic by forbidding recognition by the Allied nations as well as financial assistance which British interests were eager to give. By the same token, Costa Rica, though a declared enemy of the Central Powers, was excluded from the Peace Conference and the League. For two years Tinoco, the choice of his people, heroically withstood this outward pressure and other intrigues of our State Department. When Costa Rica neared bankruptcy his regime fell—not without bloodshed, however—and De Costa, leader in the new revolution, was elected. His recognition, while adding nothing to the principle of self-determination of small nations, further establishes that inconsistency is no hobgoblin of the single-track mind.

OUR neighbor, the *New Republic*, deserves great credit for the publication of its 42-page supplement, "A Test of the News," a painstaking analysis of the news reports on Russia published in the New York *Times* from March, 1917, to March, 1920. The authors' scrupulous fairness and their insistence that they impute no discreditable motives to the *Times* merely strengthens the indictment, the implications of which are far-reaching. As a scientific contribution to the current and increasing discussion of the trustworthiness of our news, it should be highly valuable in further drawing attention to the relation between "the raw material of thought" and the maintenance of democratic institutions.

THE most significant aspect of the trial in Chicago that has just resulted in the conviction under the State sedition law of William Bross Lloyd and a score of other members of the Communist Labor Party was the admission as evidence of speeches made prior to the passage of the statute. The Constitution of the United States forbids the passage of any *ex post facto* law, which in effect means that no person may be prosecuted for an act which was not a crime at the time it was committed, even though it may become such under some subsequent law. It is hard, therefore, to understand the conception of justice or legality that led Judge Oscar Hebel to admit in evidence speeches or writings made previous to the enactment of the law, without which the prosecution would probably have failed. The admission of such evidence was an unequivocal confession on the part of the judge and the prosecution that they were trying the defendants for a state of mind. One is reminded of the story of the German father who was going upstairs with his son, when the boy stubbed his toe. Promptly the father cuffed the boy on the head. "What for you do that?" cried the boy. "I don't say nothings." "No," replied the father, "but you think 'Damn.'" A new trial ought to be granted without question on the basis of Judge Hebel's extraordinary ruling.

THE agents of Satan having failed to organize the steel industry, the angels will now take a hand. The American Federation of Labor will cooperate in the work of smashing Mr. Gary's open shop with the Amalgamated Association of Steel and Iron Workers, "providing that William Foster is not included in the board of strategy." The drive will be on "vastly broader lines than the Foster failure." While the Federation thus outlines its plan and the press makes it clear that it is to be a safe, American, anti-Fosterian campaign, it would be interesting to know what Mr. Gary thinks about it. Would he prefer unionization at the hands of respectable circles of the Federation to unionization through a person with an improper past—economically speaking—like Mr. Foster? Will Mr. Gary, remembering the war record and unassailable respectability of Mr. Gompers, call off his Cossacks and allow freedom of meeting and speaking in his steel towns? Will he order the embargo lifted that at present in the sacred name of the "open shop" prevents the sale of structural steel to contractors who deal with the Amalgamated Association of Steel and Iron Workers? The chances are that Mr. Gary will do none of these things. To him Mr. Gompers and Mr. Foster are as brothers. There are no good and bad unions to Mr. Gary; there are only bad ones. But if Mr. Gompers and his associates succeed in unionizing the great steel barony, they will be applauded by all who are not autocrats.

NO one who cherishes American traditions can read without profound disgust the revelation of espionage in industry of which the Interchurch steel report reveals a characteristic fragment, and which was reprinted in the last issue of *The Nation*. The wholesale spying practiced in this country during the war under pretext of national peril was rotten enough. Hearsay, rumor, suspicion, and private grudges were elevated by ignoramuses and scalawags to the dignity of Military Intelligence or Department of Justice dossiers, to the detriment of decent citizens. The recent comment of Judge Anderson who, as United States District Attorney, found 99 per cent of the alleged pro-German plots fictitious, that "except in time of war when a Nathan Hale may be a spy . . . a right-minded man refuses such employment," may be accepted as conclusive. The men who risked their lives overseas while entering the enemy lines are the Nathan Hales of today. Those who from the safety of civilian concealment act as informers upon the persons with whom they are in daily contact are, and always will be, beneath the contempt of honorable men.

DEMOCRATIC and Republican schemes for reducing the cost of living are equally fatuous. Attorney-General Palmer adopted the method last winter of standing on the steps of the Department of Justice and reading procla-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MEMORIAL LIBRARY

mations in which by turn he ordered and entreated the H. C. of L. to descend. As the H. C. of L. paid no attention, but just went on climbing, Mr. Palmer took to prosecuting small merchants for profiteering. One such, an insignificant grocer of New York's East Side, has just been convicted under the Lever law of hoarding sugar; he has been sentenced to two years in Atlanta penitentiary, the extreme penalty, although he might have been given the alternative of a $5,000 fine. "I have had corporations before me, but I could do nothing but impose a money fine," said Judge Harlan B. Howe. "With Lessen, an individual, it was different, and I imposed the maximum sentence." That the little fellow gets the big sentence is a truism of our anti-profiteering technique, of which not even the converse holds. The big fellow gets no sentence at all, unless the gentle compulsion to return a part of the loot in the form of a fine may be so considered.

REPUBLICAN politicians are dissatisfied with the Democratic Administration's method of reducing prices—one cannot blame them for that—but what do they propose instead? According to Representative Slemp, if Senator Harding is elected, an extra session of Congress will be called to legislate as follows: revise and possibly entirely repeal the excess profits tax; abolish the government tax on freight and passenger traffic; increase the tariff schedules; reduce the income taxes. Now, the promise of lower taxes has an appealing sound, but somehow or other the money must be found to pay our debts and enormous current expenses. The Republican proposal is simply to lessen direct and increase indirect taxes; in other words, to reduce specific payments now called for from the well-to-do and spread the whole sum out over rich and poor in the form of consumption taxes. Has Senator Harding forgotten that our last Republican President disrupted his party's national convention and lost every State in the union except Utah and Vermont largely because he signed a high tariff bill when the country wanted lower duties? The Republicans are not proposing to lower the cost of living for the ordinary man, but to reduce the high cost of being rich.

LABOR, according to the monthly report of the Federal Reserve Board, is becoming more efficient. It is "less insistent in its demands," "a better spirit of cooperation is said to exist between employer and employee." This happy state of affairs does not go uninterpreted. With only a few lines of explanation inserted to divide cause from effect, the Federal Reserve Board cites as an important factor in the change in labor conditions "the development of unemployment in various parts of the country." The implications of this sequence are interesting. Poor transportation, resulting in a curtailment of production, shutting down mills "as a result of cancelation of orders and lack of demand," inability to obtain capital—these things result in unemployment and the consequent encouraging increase in labor efficiency. To the uninitiated this would appear to be a puzzling analysis. The public gets fewer products, and consequently pays more for what it gets; the workers get fewer jobs. But the manufacturer is happy; his prices rise, his costs decrease, his labor is efficient, "less insistent in its demands," and more cooperative in spirit. How long will it be before business realizes that its own interests are injured by this callous and short-sighted attitude toward the workers?

MARCUS GARVEY is a sort of Billy Sunday of the Negro race. Within a year he has built up an organization of Negroes which claims a million members in the world and probably has half a million in the United States alone. His Universal Negro Improvement Association, which has just held a "Convention of the Negro Race" in New York city and elected a "President of Africa," has branches throughout the West Indies, along the west coast of Africa, and in South America as well as North. It preaches a gospel of pride in the Negro race and its future, with a superb and ignorant fanaticism which has the Sunday movement as its only white parallel. Garvey's all-Negro Black Star steamship line bids fair to be as profitable a commercial venture as the Billy Sunday song-book and syndicated-sermon business. And the dream of a vast Negro republic in Africa may be at least as probable as some of Billy Sunday's prophecies. The parceling of Africa among the white powers is a matter of the last half-century, and there is no reason to believe that so unnatural a condition will endure forever. If such preaching as Garvey's should lead to a bloody race revolt in Africa, we should have to blame the white race more than the Garveys. The best of Garvey's gospel, like the best of Billy Sunday's, is old stuff; but he gives it an emotional color and a stage setting of flags and costumes which appeals to Negroes untouched by more dignified and better balanced leaders. The worst of Garvey is sheer fanaticism and demagoguery. It is a pity that any one concerned for the freedom of black Africa and the future of the Negro race should go out of his way to attack so fine-spirited an apostle of his race as Dr. Du Bois.

THE prediction of twenty-five or thirty cent milk for New York City next winter may turn out to be only an excited guess, but the serious mention of such a price calls attention sharply to a situation which cannot much longer be neglected. Every large city in the country, as well as innumerable smaller ones, is threatened with a price schedule which can have no other effect than to remove milk in the near future from the class of necessaries of life, certainly from the list of foods ordinarily consumed, and to transfer it to the already swollen list of luxuries. Even at present prices only the cheaper grades of milk, necessarily deficient in nutritive value, can be afforded by persons of moderate means; while for the poor, milk has all but disappeared from the list of daily foods save for infants and the sick. With the growth of population, grazing land, especially near cities, is decreasing in quantity and increasing in value; less winter feed is raised at home and more is brought from a distance; while the demands of the community in the shape of taxes on the one hand and sanitary requirements on the other, not to speak of advancing wages and mounting transportation rates, show no diminution. Under such circumstances the regulation of the production and the price of milk ought no longer to be left to the discretion of the farmer or to bargaining between producers and distributors. If the children of the very near future are to have milk at prices which persons who are not millionaires can afford to pay, the state will have to take over the milk industry and run it as a public enterprise, as Governor Smith of New York has recommended. Even a material reduction, which certainly ought to be made, of the excessive profits which some large distributing concerns exact will afford only temporary relief. The trouble is in the lack of a sufficient supply of milk under existing production and distribution.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Railroad Rate Increases

THE size of the award of the Interstate Commerce Commission, authorizing freight rate and passenger fare increases sufficient to produce $1,600,000,000, is less important in itself than in its final effects on the country. The treatment of transportation as a private, profit-making business, rather than a public service, and the inefficiency and waste incident to monopoly power and reliance on a government guarantee for profits, bid fair to impose a crushing burden on the consuming public and to have an injurious, possibly calamitous, effect on industry. Transportation and credit control the life of a people. Cheap, efficient, and orderly organization of the transportation agencies lies at the basis of production, distribution, and exchange. It is an open question if private banking management and ineptitude on the part of Congress have not produced a condition in which the railroads will progressively impair the economic life of the nation.

Former Director-General Hines stated in a western address that freight rate increases were cumulative. They were an excuse for profiteering. He cited the increase of ten cents a ton on anthracite coal, which amounted to fifty cents when it reached the consumer. Robert W. Woolley of the Interstate Commerce Commission has repeatedly stated that for every dollar added to freight earnings the consumer pays from three to five dollars in added costs. On these estimates the final cost to the public of the rate advances will not be the $1,600,000,000 that the railroads collect, but from $5,000,000,000 to $8,000,000,000 that the consumers ultimately pay. If the consumer pays only what the railroads get, there will be an increase of $75 a year in the cost of living of every family of five in the country, and, if the estimates of Mr. Hines and Mr. Woolley are confirmed, the final cost may amount to five times that sum, or $375 per family. This will eat up the recent wage award to the two million railway workers, and will be followed by another demand from them for advanced pay.

What will be the effect of the rate increases on production? There has already been a slackening of freight movement due in part to high costs. The increase in freight rates will undoubtedly reduce the amount of freight hauled by hundreds of millions of tons annually. It will kill many kinds of business altogether and will seriously hamper our foreign trade. It has been estimated that motor trucks now haul one-fourth of the freight of the country. It is mostly short-haul traffic between the larger cities. The motor truck may absorb so much transportation that the rate increases will add far less than the estimated sum of $1,600,000,000 to the railroads. There is a point in transportation cost that not only destroys traffic; it drives it to find other means of conveyance.

The effects of the rate increases on the farmer are evident. The price of wheat is fixed in the markets of the world. The American farmer receives the Liverpool price, fixed by the competition of other countries, less what it costs the American farmer to get his wheat to the Liverpool market. The farmers of America will pay a considerable part of the rate increases. They cannot shift the burden to anyone else. The American farmer is being driven from the land. His explanation is that he is so preyed on by middlemen and speculators, by the packers and the millers, by the railroads and the banks, by those who buy what he produces, that he cannot make a living. He says he raises wheat and cattle at a loss. That dairying has become so unprofitable that cattle are being killed is a matter of everyday experience. Often crops rot on the ground because of the inability of the farmer to secure freight cars or storage.

Under the Esch-Cummins law Congress has provided a "cost plus" transportation system that invites waste. The railroads are guaranteed operating costs and then six per cent on the valuation of the property. The book cost of that property is $20,040,572,611; the Interstate Commerce Commission fixed the value at $18,900,000,000, practically 95 per cent of the value claimed by the companies. While the railroad operators are denied the right to make profits in excess of six per cent from the railroads, they are not denied the right to make any profits they can on the side. An investigation made by the Interstate Commerce Commission before the war of the outside interests of railroad directors and officials disclosed that the railroads bought almost everything they used from corporations which the railroad directors or stockholders either owned or controlled. This was true of coal, of rails, of cars, of locomotives, of brakes and equipment, of supplies of all kinds. The cost of coal alone is in excess of $500,000,000 a year. There is no obligation on the railroad officials to buy in the open market or to invite competition. They buy from themselves. It is to their private interest to operate the railroads wastefully.

A year ago, under unified federal control, freight cars were moving 28 miles a day; now they are moving about 22. The economies of unified administration have disappeared. We have 2,449,000 freight cars, and need 300,000 more, we are told. To raise the average car movement from 22 to 28 miles a day would be equivalent to adding more than 650,000 cars. Yet we give the present management its six per cent, in order that it may spend $700,000,000 for new equipment to be mismanaged in the same way as that which it now has.

It is probable that the rate increases will be followed in a short time by demands for further rate increases. That has been the experience with local franchise corporations. With dividends guaranteed by the public utility commissions, and with waste invited by inside contracts and manipulations, it is much easier to fall back on political agencies which guarantee wastage than it is to introduce economies and bring about efficiency.

The inherent evils of the transportation act are far greater than the rate increases, calamitous and in large part unnecessary as they are. For they could have been avoided in large part, if not wholly, by a continuation of federal control and the unification of the transportation facilities of the country. Mr. Hines was reporting net earnings over and above all expenses in the operation of the railways from July to October of last year. He was paying the standard return and was making a profit for the government. In addition the employees were loyal; they were protected by wage adjustment boards in which they had confidence, and were ready to enter into collective bargaining arrangements that would have called forth many economies and greater efficiency than is possible under the warring, waste-inviting system of which we are just beginning to pay the cost.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The End of Versailles

WHATEVER the outcome of the blustering hesitations and half-hearted ultimatums of the Allies and of the relentless advance and skilful diplomacy of the Russians, the Polish adventure has made so much clear: the Treaty of Versailles is dead. Whether the Red armies overrun all of present-day Poland and sovietize the entire region, whether Soviet Russia returns to Germany Danzig and the other German regions annexed to Poland, or whether the Allies determine upon a desperate struggle against the victorious Russians and hold Danzig as a base of operations, the territorial provisions, the heart of the treaty, will be revised. Intact the treaty was not, even before the final disaster. The treaty was a compound of a dream of a governed and united world, and of extremely definite provisions to satisfy the blood lust manifested in Lloyd George's khaki elections of 1918 and Clemenceau's *bloc national* triumph of 1919. The treaty was hardly a solution; it was an emulsion of contrary policies. The League of Mr. Wilson's dreams emerged with all central and eastern Europe left out, and inevitably became the plaything of the British Foreign Office. The revenge clauses have been dropped or modified in response to the prosaic realizations of unsentimental daily life. The Kaiser is not to be hanged; the German military leaders are not to be tried before Allied courts; the German army is not yet disarmed—and, with the greater Russian "peril" before them, the Allies are not likely to force its disarmament; the coal and other reparations clauses have been scaled down from the treaty terms to meet the arguments of practical economists. Now even the territorial provisions seem likely to fall.

The Treaty of Versailles was a dictated document; it was not a product of common counsels. Whatever succeeds it will be the outcome of negotiations in which the Germans and probably the Austrians and Hungarians as well will take part on a footing of at least official equality. And it is not likely that the Russians will play any such humiliating role as was played by the defeated Germans at Versailles; they are more likely to be the dictators. France has already made a bargain with Hungary for her aid against Russia, and whether the Hungarian army goes into the field against Soviet Russia or not, a part of the bargain, in the shape of rather substantial modifications of the treaty with Hungary, will probably persist. Germany has announced her neutrality in any conflict between the Allies and Soviet Russia, and if she is to be budged from that attitude, it will be only at the price of substantial concessions. The Bolsheviki are likely to offer Germany the famous Danzig corridor, and the Allies, if they would hold Germany to the rest of her bond, will have to offer as favorable terms.

No such wind of idealism is blowing across Europe today as when the Peace Conference opened; there are no such exaggerated hopes of a new and better world, no such pathetic faith in the regenerative results of war. Perhaps it is just as well. Less attention will be paid to words, less effort will be made to soothe with fine phrases. There may be more attention given to the desires of peoples and less to the schemes of governments. Organized labor in western Europe may supersede the Foreign Offices as a factor in reconstruction. The tidal wave of communism will have to be faced.

Who Wouldn't Desert—for Paris?

IT is with a renewed appreciation of the versatility and virtuosity of the American soldier that we "see by the papers" that there are 1,500 deserters from the A. E. F. in Paris, most of them practicing the profession of "bad man." Now it takes a good man to be a "bad man" almost anywhere, but it takes a corking good man to be a "bad man" in Paris—and get away with it. Few Americans have proved themselves sufficiently adaptable to make a living against the Frenchman on his own ground, and if 1,500 of them have shown themselves able to compete with that most inbred and clannish French product, the Paris *apache*, one wonders why they have not received some mention by the scribes who write on foreign opportunities for the government's popular daily, *Commerce Reports*. This story of 1,500 army deserters who carry "guns," live in "secret underground passages," and derive their income chiefly from the illicit sale of drugs is not mere American brag; it is on the word of the Paris police, and the *gendarme* is not only without pity but also without any narrow national bigotry in his estimate of "bad men." Before this story came over we had almost begun to despair of the American ever understanding France. Most of our soldiers brought back the ideas they took over. But the only explanation of these 1,500 American soldiers who are listed in the army records as deserters is that they have succumbed to the charm of Paris; they have come to appreciate France.

Doubtless one must take with a grain of salt some of the statements about these wayward members of the American army in Paris. The "secret underground passages" of Montmartre, for instance, are only the embroidery of energetic press correspondents. About the only underground passages in Montmartre are those of the Métro and the Nord-Sud, and they are public to anyone who has the fare. But there are other means than secret underground passages whereby one may live among the twisted streets and jumbled houses of that hill of romance and rags beyond the boulevards of Clichy and Rochechouart, fairly secure from undue familiarity on the part of the police. One must, however, be of the people and have their language for such a life. The Kingdom of Argot is not so powerful today as that which Victor Hugo describes in "Notre-Dame." The Truands have fallen on less lusty days. Yet one must know more French than enough merely to enter a restaurant and call "Oouffs!" in order to survive in the underworld of Montmarte.

One suspects that these deserters are not quite such "bad men" as the police and the Paris correspondents would have us believe. Perhaps after all they are only getting the education, travel, and adventure that the army recruiting posters advertise. Perhaps they are only daring young Americans with that passion for freedom, that zest for struggle, that contempt for the conventional that characterized our pioneer days. And behind it all, we suspect, are certain young Parisiennes. For they do say that men are only as bad as women want them to be, and to win the esteem of some of those of Paris one might be forgiven for going nearly 100 per cent.

Sometimes we suspect we would desert the army of the Angel Gabriel, encamped before the Pearly Gates, for Paris, Montmartre, and—ah, well, probably we also belong in the category of "bad men."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Critic and His Uses

THE critic's character, like the poet's, has undergone many transformations in the course of time. During long ages the didactic notion of the critic prevailed, and learned and self-satisfied men cling to it still. According to this notion, which commends itself easily to superficial thinking, the critic is an expert in fixed rules by which art is to be judged. He handles standards, both moral and aesthetic, very much as a draper does his yard-stick. No subtlety of learning or refinement of reasoning changes the character of the didactic critic to whose gigantic futility the history of his craft bears eloquent witness. His anterior assumptions always invalidated his judgments, and his divine yard-stick turned out to be the weapon of his angry prejudices. The scientific critic, a type that flourished mightily but briefly, is both more amiable and less pretentious. But he is the victim of an analogy of deadly falseness. You can classify phenomena that are identical—moons, beetles, rocks. You cannot classify phenomena that are unique. There is no "évolution des genres" because, closely looked upon, there are no "genres." There are only individuals expressing their personal sense of life in art; and there are the imitators of these individuals who do not count.

The impressionists were fully aware of the sterility of both the didactic and the scientific methods. They sought to disengage the peculiar aroma of books and pictures and, being frankly subjective, produced many pages of beautiful creative literature. But they restricted themselves a little narrowly to aesthetic considerations and, conscious always of their reaction against the older schools, hesitated to assume the critical functions which they had seen so absurdly exercised. A gentle pessimism haunts all their books, and the elegiac sense of the passing of a world from which their own souls were not yet wholly estranged. If Sainte-Beuve wrote "the natural history of minds," the impressionists clung timidly to the history of their own minds. They paid homage to the dead rules of criticism by not daring to proceed without them beyond the autumnal gardens of their own souls.

It is at this point that the modern critic parts company with the masters whom he has loved and from whom he has learned so much. His is a hardier and a cooler nature. Skepticism does not wound his heart and the perception of change leaves him quite untroubled. He has shifted his whole point of vision and has no inner or outer need of any comfortable absolutes. For he sees art as an integral part of the life-process, as the life-process itself growing articulate through chosen personalities. That it should do so at all, that life should speak in terms of beauty—this is to him the central and sufficient fact which satisfies the "idealistic" cravings of his mind. Beauty exists—there is his heartening and transcendent truth. In beauty he admits differences of method, of growth, and degrees of intensity; he admits no moralistic qualifications of better or worse, higher or lower, through the choice of one sort of subject matter rather than another or one technique of expression rather than another. Veracity of substance and intensity of expression are his sole tests. He may privately entertain the opinion that certain kinds of subjects and certain technical methods have actually made for veracity and intensity more often than others. But he is eager to have that opinion refuted and the realm of beauty thus enlarged. He knows nothing of a beauty that is wrong or immoral. He knows, negatively, only the false or the feeble expression that misses its own inherent aim through disloyalty to experience or through failure in articulateness. Wherever deep experience attains intense expression, there is art.

This critic, like the poet, is born and can hardly be made. The reading of many books will help him little unless he has the sense of life, unless its throb comes to him even through alien speech and remote forms. No partisanship must curb his humanity, no prejudice blunt the sensitiveness of his spirit. He must be himself a seeker after beauty, after the expression that makes life luminous and rich; he must be able to identify his own self with men and things. And he must be sensitive to the general drift of the many lives that make the world, and neither expect romantic expansiveness in small and rigid societies nor the severities of classical synthesis in an age of democratic revolution. He must share imaginatively the life of other periods and very practically that of his own. The passions of its freest minds must be his also, though at the core he may always keep a touch of coolness to save his inner processes from hardening even in the best of causes. His highest aim will always be to keep his perception of the relation of literature to life firm and unclouded, lest in the ardor of his personal seeking he fall into the old error of condemning passions he does not share or opinions to which he is hostile. All life must be his province. If it is, he cannot go far wrong in his dealings with art. If he has been, directly or vicariously, a part of all human experience, the expression of no form of it can startle or befog his mind.

His function in modern society is a grave and arduous one. He must constantly reinterpret the past for the uses of the present, in order that it may contribute to the creation of that cultural atmosphere which is his final practical aim. Thus he will be both philosopher and historian. He will illustrate the continuity and oneness of art as the expression of life, and thus establish at once the validity and use of the art of his own contemporaries. This art he will be careful to interpret in relation to the vital forces from which it springs, in order that by its reaction on its audience it may serve to establish the cultural environment within which the experience of individuals can be most free and rich. None will be more acutely aware of this interaction between art and life than himself, or do more to clarify it and make it effectual. The expression of life in art reacts on life. Poets create new moods in love for their hearers; dramatists have altered the structure of society. It will be the critic's task to heighten and increase this enrichment and liberation of life. He will seek to make art, which expresses life, reenter life through the sharpened senses of all capable of receiving its impressions.

The virtue of this program of the modern critic is that it translates the severest spiritual efforts into direct social action, and yet leaves him serene and detached. To free souls through the ministry of art, to create an atmosphere in which that freedom may be exercised and art itself may thrive—these are the ends for which he will unceasingly labor. The purely aesthetic has not lost its magic or its glow for him. But it needs no nursing. It will appear whenever the source of art, which is experience, is kept untrammeled, strong, and full.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Will Russia Drive the British from Asia?

By HENRY G. ALSBERG

Moscow, June 16

BY all odds the most interesting aspect of Moscow at the moment is the seething and boiling and bubbling of the international situation there. Last week our hotel was decorated with a sign to the following effect: "Long live the Revolution; we started it; let us finish it together." This significant motto was directed at the rather cautious British delegation of the Independent Labor, the Labor Party and the Trades Union Congress, which made a pilgrimage to the socialist Mecca. Shortly after them came a delegation of syndicalists from Germany, and a few days later a clump of British shop stewards, who were shoveled out of England in a coal bunker. Bulgarian communists, French right and lefters and middle-of-the-roadsters, Marcel Cachin and Frossard, Guilbeaux and Sadoul, and a mysterious French old gentleman with a motherly wife who live down the hall two doors and borrowed my rug to cover the matrimonial bed, and look as if they ought to be tending a bit of a garden outside Paris, green with lettuce, radish-tops and tropical with young artichokes, but who are, I understand, redder than Bucharin—these are a few of the inhabitants of our Hotel Delavoid Dvor. But today there arrived the biggest trump card playable by the Third Internationale, the Italian delegation, headed by such aces as Serratti, with a vivacious black-eyed phalanx of delegates. Not a bit cautious they, but decorated all over with red badges and "Long live the Revolution." To greet them the British sign of welcome was displaced and an Italian one substituted reading, "Il Trionfo della Dittatura del Proletariato." Next week comes a Swiss delegation. Meanwhile the Swedish crowd has gone off to inspect the Ural steel works and mines and is arranging to take over a whole factory and fill it with expert Swedish mechanics who are to raise production of machinery. Naturally a certain number of Irish rebels are here also, several of whose names are as well known in America as in Ireland. A good deal of josh-ing between them and the British went on at meal-times on the subject of Ireland. Yesterday I interviewed the Georgian provisional diplomatic agent; tomorrow I shall interview the Armenian delegation negotiating peace with the Turks, who are represented here by Kemal himself, whom I have met. Today Dr. Hung Hing Kwan, Ambassador of the Provisional Korean government at Shanghai, presents his credentials to Chicherin, and a protest against Japanese oppression. In a very few days a great meeting of delegates to a workingman's congress, representing Chinese workingmen, will meet here. Moscow's streets are star-scattered with twinkling almond eyes. A former minister of the Transbaikal Republic has arrived with news of the latest Japanese oppressions in the Far East, of which more hereafter. In short, with the meeting of the Third Internationale to be held in the beginning of July, Moscow, and not San Remo or Spa, has become the real center of the world. Those two towns and the Supreme Council are only side shows to the one big show on earth. Admission free, if you have your coupon from the Third Internationale!

If I could collect and put into one volume the adventures of each delegate during his journey Russiawards, I think I could, as author of romance, surpass him of the celebrated "Dead-Eye Dick." Our English shop stewards came by the now common, and by all really adventurous souls considered commonplace, coal bunker route. Others have wandered around the Murmansk passage. A German happens to be leader of a German sailors' syndicate and travels under protection of his followers without passport or ticket. An Argentinian came from Italy by underground route. It seems, if you are a real communist, you can travel where and how you like, without passport or without paying any fare. There are two governmental systems spread throughout Europe now, and the lesser of these is not the revolutionary. If you have your passport from the latter you can thumb your nose at the former. If you have a passport from both, naturally, you may travel from Tibet to Timbuctoo, from the wilds of Burmah to those of Broadway, and "no one shall you let." You can then, as is the case with one youth of my acquaintance, buy agricultural machinery in Great Britain and deliver same, in the shape of machine-guns in—well, it is better not to be too definite.

At any rate the coming session of the Third Internationale promises to be the most stirring event of our time. The last meeting, when Europe was at war and the underground routes had not yet been properly developed, was a bit too much facade and too little building. In those days, I imagine, credentials of delegates were not so closely scrutinized. Korean and Persian and British communist delegates were not very easy to find and one just had to do with whatever representatives one had at hand. But this year the situation has quite changed. No matter how irregular your method of travel, you will not be admitted to this convention unless the credentials committee is absolutely satisfied with the validity of your papers. I imagine that, in some cases, indeed, as in our own conventions, there are and will be rival delegations and contests. But in the end, under the wing of the mother of the present proletarian revolution, will meet the most impressive international gathering, in fact the only really international gathering for the discussion and settlement of the rights of the great masses of laboring, sweating, and toiling humanity that the world has ever seen.

But all this gathering of the proletarian clans has another and more serious meaning for the world. The Third Internationale of this year marks a turning point in the development of Soviet Russia. I have spoken with Chicherin, with Radek and other notables of the government. Until now it was hoped that Russia could obtain peace and a free development of all her tremendous forces without first engaging in an offensive against the capitalist states. I asked Chicherin directly whether he considered it possible for a communist state like Russia to live in peace and amicable trade with the capitalist world. He stated emphatically that he could see no just impediment thereto. He pointed out that after having cleared up the civil war Russia had begun to demobilize and beat her bayonets into pruning hooks. He drew attention to his government's offer of peace to Poland, to Latvia, to Finland and to Rumania. He pointed out that despite the fact that Russia could have

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

worked to raise India, Persia and other colored dependencies against Britain, Russia had, even during the period of the Archangel, Denikin and Judenich interventions, refrained from using this weapon as vigorously as it might. Another official in the Foreign Office supplemented this statement by asserting that immediately after the civil war's conclusion all Russia's activities in the Near and Far East and India hostile to Britain ceased at once, absolutely and in good faith. I believe that both these statements of Chicherin and other Soviet officials must be accepted as quite sincere and true.

But now came the Polish offensive. Chicherin quite freely admits, and so does Radek, that Great Britain is forcing Russia into a war *à l'outrance*, a war never desired, but which, once commenced, may shake the British Empire to its foundations. At the moment of writing, after the taking of Kiev by the Bolsheviki, it seems as if the Russian offensive may press through to that tinder-box of Eastern Galicia, which, once ablaze, may ignite the whole of central Europe, but certainly will run through that heap of social, political, and economic combustibles known as Poland. Members of the British delegation, just returned from the front at Bobrissof, tell me they talked with numbers of Polish prisoners, all of whom swore they were deserters, that the mass of the Polish army was demoralized, and that they would never return to Poland to live.

Meanwhile Russian agents will do everything in their power to raise the Near and Far East against Britain. This will not be difficult. Russia and England have changed roles. Formerly, at least part of the world, the Armenians, for instance, looked to Britain as the liberator and Russia as the oppressor. Now Russia has become the hope of all down-trodden peoples, and Britain plays the part of intriguing despot. Only yesterday I had an interview with the Georgian representatives, who had just received a telegram from their government complaining bitterly against the landing in Batum, by the British, of Denikin bands and soldiery from Constantinople. Georgia had here been considered as a "White" government, and hostile to Soviet Russia. Now, naturally, the Georgians are driven into Russia's arms. The Turkish Anatolian Republic, which represents Turkish national aspirations against Entente acquisitiveness, also recognizes the fact that Russia does not mean to encroach on Anatolia, and therefore places itself under Russian protection. Kemal's government, so Chicherin told me, actually ceased its attack on Armenia at the Soviet government's request and has agreed to make peace with Armenia, the basis of peace to be a guarantee by Turkey against any further massacres and the reinstatement of fugitive Armenian populations in Turkish Armenia, all such territory to be joined with Russian and Persian Armenia to form the Armenian republic. Turkish and Armenian "islands" of population are to be gradually evacuated and resettled in purely Turkish and Armenian territory. While the Entente talked, and Armenians were being murdered, Russia stepped into the breach with a sensible solution. Moreover, to solve the vexed Constantinople question Russia proposes the only equitable remedy—that the straits shall be controlled by those powers bordering on the Black Sea, Bulgaria, Rumania, Russia, Armenia, Georgia, and Turkey. Here you have a bid for the friendship of the littoral states.

In Persia, owing to the fact that Britain has deliberately persisted in pre-war policy long ago repudiated by the Soviet government, Russia is considered the liberator and the North Persian government has in grateful recognition cut its dress after the soviet pattern. It is claimed here that the Persian revolution was a case of spontaneous combustion without even an ignition spark being struck from the North. In India the Amritsar revelations easily explain why Russia should be considered the savior. I have just this minute talked with one of the Indian delegates, whom I met in the corridor. He knows some of the people I know in New York and has come to swear allegiance to the Third Internationale. He will talk tonight at the Central Soviet Executive Committee's public meeting in the opera house. In China things are boiling. A Chinese delegation may be on the way. The Korean position I have already referred to. The Japanese situation I leave for the last.

Now, with this vast chain of good-will toward Russia and bad-will toward England already forged, it would seem to have been the part of madness to provoke the Soviet government out of a passive into an active role. I think now the government's chiefs are quite convinced that they never will have peace until they have thoroughly frightened their old arch-enemy. Cynics may say that history always repeats itself and that the only outcome of the war was to accentuate again the old inevitable rivalry between the two greatest world powers. He might say that the war has given Britain Africa and Syria, Mesopotamia, Arabia and Constantinople, and Russia Persia and most of Asia Minor. This statement would be true with considerable modifications. No doubt Russia will now support Kemal's Turkey, and the other new Near Eastern states in their fight against Britain. Russia is also sending agents to Afghanistan and Baluchistan. She has helped Djemal Pasha to go Indiawards and make trouble. Enver is in the Caucasus. By the time this is published these matters will no longer be secret. Russia will use every means to bring Britain to her senses. But at bottom her ends are defensive. She wants to be let alone—and she will be let alone or she will rend the man in pieces that tickles her once too often with a barbed stick. On the other hand, she sincerely desires, I am convinced, to allow all the new Near Eastern republics to exist as free and independent nations. If they come into her orbit, it will be freely, owing to political and economic sympathies. I repeat, Britain has never faced so extraordinary a danger as at the present moment. Russia does not need to send huge expeditionary forces to India. The inhabitants need only be armed and provisioned to come rolling down from the border states to smash the British Raj—with the help of revolting population and troops in India itself. In Mesopotamia there are constant revolts, which, with a little material help, may serve to turn the recent conquerors out. Persia has already commenced to shake off her chains. England may continue to hold isolated Ireland in bondage, but unless she takes a quick decision to make peace with the Soviets, Asia will begin to move. The Soviet leaders are convinced that hitherto all their peace overtures have been received by Europe as signs of weakness. Therefore they feel that this time only "force, force, without stint or limit," to borrow Wilson's phrase, will convince. They point out, however, that had Britain made peace a year ago her position would have been better; she would have had Baku and Persia. The longer she goes on delaying, the worse the terms she will get. As for the Poles, they will now get the boundary of Brest-Litovsk, minus the corridor to the sea

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and Danzig, and minus Eastern Galicia, which, together with other regions occupied by Poles, will be given plebiscites.

The situation of Russo-Japanese relations is peculiar. The Transbaikal Republic was formed as a buffer state to keep Japan and Russia apart. But Japan was not satisfied with the radical democracy of this republic and tried to establish a second buffer state with the Pacific littoral provinces, Amur and Vladivostok. But this second republic proved really Red, and moreover joined itself promptly to the Transbaikal Republic. Then peace negotiations opened between the Transbaikal Republic and Japan. These recently have been broken off because Japan demanded that the republic agree to have no intercourse of any sort whatsoever, political, commercial, or even by travel of citizens, with Soviet Russia. To insure performance a quarantine zone 270 miles wide on the western border of the Transbaikal Republic was to be established, and also the republic was to extend west to Irkutsk. Otherwise Japanese troops were not to be withdrawn. Meanwhile the Transbaikal Republic has sent a telegram to the Japanese commander-in-chief and to the Japanese government, stating that Japanese military were sheltering bands consisting of Kolchak, Annenkop, Kappel, and Semenov bands which were ravaging the country and robbing and murdering the civilian populations. The turn of the Japanese will come eventually.

The Great Woolen Strike

By GEORGE SOULE

Profiteering is a crime of commission; underproduction is a crime of omission.—Senator Warren G. Harding.

IN 1912 the I. W. W. stopped production in Lawrence. In 1919 the workers again withdrew their labor, under the leadership of the Amalgamated Textile Workers of America. But the strike of 1920, the strike of capital at the command of William M. Wood, president of the American Woolen Company, is far more widespread and sinister. At a word, fifty-four mills throughout the Northeastern States locked their doors, throwing out of employment over 40,000 people and threatening about 200,000 souls with destitution. These mills cover seven hundred acres and have ten million square feet of floor space. They are counted on the books of the owners as worth about forty-five million dollars. If we figure the loss on this idle investment at 7 per cent—an absurdly low rate considering the recent earnings of the company—a two months' shut-down will cost about $525,000. This, at the least, will be passed on to the public when the mills reopen. In addition, there is the tremendous loss—never to be made up—of needed goods.

In Lawrence one can still hear the clatter of the Pacific and other great mills, but the four plants of the American Woolen Company are dourly silent. Knots of Italians, French Canadians, Lithuanians, Poles, Syrians, and Franco-Belgians gather on the corners and loaf in the parks. Some have found jobs in other factories, some have gone out to the farms, there is a steady trickle back to Europe. But the scale will be balanced, probably, by immigrants coming in. About five thousand have lost their jobs in Lawrence. For awhile the merchants will give them credit. Few of them have savings. Said a young Italian: "I like dress up nice, like anyone; I eat once in a while beefsteak, like American. I save nothing. Some others no care how they look, eat all time vegetable and spaghetti—they save little, not much." There are two workers' cooperative stores and two bakeries. "We give credit so long we have goods," said the manager. "Two-three weeks, goods all gone, what can do?" He ended with an Italian shrug. "I tell you what trouble," argued one, "we work too hard, produce too much." "Mr. Wood," countered a youth with superior scorn, "he got lots money, he own mills, eat all he like. Working people make shoes, clothes, food, all kinda things for him, no can eat. Sometime working people own mills, make things for themselves."

It is not only among the workers that Mr. Wood is unpopular. Nor only among the purchasers of clothing, either. The wool growers cannot sell their clips at any price, and are on the verge of despair. The merchants of Lawrence, whom Mr. Wood called profiteers not so long ago when he established his company store, are now threatened with bankruptcy. The clothing manufacturers and piece-goods jobbers, angry at the prices they have been paying, have canceled their orders in thousands. His fellow textile manufacturers are annoyed at the tactless way in which he has called down condemnation on the industry and has confused their labor policy. Even some of his stockholders are becoming restive. Yet strikers, as a rule, are too hastily condemned; usually they have substantial grievances. I determined to discover, if possible, Mr. Wood's.

Perhaps the American Woolen Company had not been making a living wage. The financial authorities show that the firm has had, until this summer, $20,000,000 of common stock, and $40,000,000 of 7 per cent cumulative preferred. In 1917 its net profits were over fifteen and a half million, in 1918 over twelve million, in 1919 over fifteen and a half million again. It has charged off large sums to depreciation, and now has a surplus of $31,754,426. Since the war began, it has earned as much as the total par value of its capital stock—and it is by no means undercapitalized. After deducting the preferred dividends from its 1919 profits, it still had enough left to have paid, if it had wished, over fifty per cent dividends on its common. That is not exactly penury. Of course the cost of living of its idle stockholders may now have risen so that they must receive more. No one has yet compiled a minimum subsistence budget for a millionaire's family. Polo ponies, yachts, and country estates, it is true, have gone up frightfully; gasoline is high, and as for servants—! Yet Mr. Wood has not asked for larger profits. He has, however, given several intimations that he will not accept less. On the occasion of the last 15 per cent raise in wages, he was asked if it would be passed on to the public. "Of course it will be passed on to the public," he is reported to have answered. "What did you think we are going to do with it?" The company has just issued about twenty million dollars more of common at par to the present holders, and the money is not to be used for new investment, according to Mr. Wood. It amounts to a stock dividend, in expectation of a continuation of present earnings.

Can the mills procure raw material? There is an unprecedented glut in the raw wool market. Federal Reserve banks are advancing loans on Montana wool at only 20 cents a pound, when, according to estimates in the New York market, the wool should bring from 50 to 55 cents a pound—this price being much lower than last year's. Ohio growers are unable to dispose of their clip at any price—even at half what they received a year ago. The

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

British Government is about to raise the restrictions on the purchase of Australian wool.

Do the mills desire to make a lower quality of goods, then? That is hardly possible. Half a billion pounds of shoddy were used last year—enough, according to the National Sheep and Wool Bureau of America, to have made more than half the "all wool" cloth produced. This, while a billion pounds of virgin wool was filling the storehouses. The American Woolen Company is already largely engaged in turning out the cheaper grades of goods, and has used much of the shoddy.

Is this normally the dull season for textiles? No, it is normally the busy season. The fact that the mills are not running will surely bring on acute shortage next fall.

Mr. Wood's grievances, by the time all this has come to light, begin to seem obscure. Before pursuing them further, we may examine some of the charges against him. In search of these, I called on Mayor William P. White, of Lawrence. "Welcome to our city," was his greeting. Mayor White is a large Irishman with a countenance the shape of a Bartlet pear. His professions are horse-trader and politician. In 1910 he was serving his first term, and soon thereafter he served fourteen months in jail on a charge of grafting. He had previously, while milk inspector, run afoul of the law. Now he is mayor again, "vindicated," he says, "by the sovereign will of the people." "Is it true, Mr. Mayor," I asked, "that you said Mr. Wood is showing ingratitude in closing his mills now, because the city spent $100,000 in dealing with the last strike?" "Between $90,000 and $100,000," he corrected. "Yes, I said that. And Mr. Wood never contributed a cent of it," he added, as if deeply grieved. The Mayor certainly deserved Mr. Wood's gratitude for his treatment of the strikers. They were clubbed on the streets and in jail; they were not allowed to stand on the sidewalks or parade or hold outdoor meetings; machine guns were ostentatiously displayed; the Commissioner of Public Safety "withdrew the protection of the law" from the strikers, and one of their leaders was immediately afterwards abducted and nearly lynched by a band of masked men. And for all this Mr. Wood had not paid a cent! Yet what are governments for, if not to preserve law and order? Lest I get the hospitable Mayor into trouble, I must add that he confided to me that Mr. Wood is really "all right," but that he sometimes has "bad advisers." The Mayor, after consulting unnamed authority, has just refused a permit for a meeting by the union.

The workers are tired of pretending Mr. Wood is popular. On several occasions they have been taken out of the mills on full pay during working hours, and mobilized with brass bands for demonstrations of welcome, or what not, for Mr. Wood, who has entered the city with flowers strewn in his path, for all the world like a little king greeting his loyal subjects. Recently they have been invited to several picnics at his summer residence. But they insist they would rather have less cake and more bread. Mr. Wood denies their charge that when the mills reopen it will be at lower wages. "I've done everything possible for my employees. They have health and sick benefits. Working mothers have been accorded the privilege of a great, beautiful nursery and an ideal kindergarten. . . . I hire expert nurses for the protection of my workers' health. . . . My workers have the benefit of every progressive endeavor of which I have ever heard." Why should they expect continuous employment, recognition of the union, freedom and power? Base ingratitude, my lord! Mr. Wood is merely following the example of Mr. Gary and Mr. Rockefeller and the rest.

How about the American Woolen Company as a profiteer? The government accused it of making 35 per cent on the cost of production, and Mr. Wood replied—in the press—that he made only 12½ per cent. When he came to the courts, he did not bring any figures, but secured the quashing of the indictment on the ground that cloth is not clothing "within the meaning of the law." But what is the moral difference, anyway, between 12½ and 35 per cent? Just where does the profit-maker become the profiteer? Shouldn't a business firm make all it can while the making is good, and lay aside some for a rainy day?—for rainy days, even cloudbursts, are likely to occur under private enterprise. How can Mr. Wood help it if people were willing to pay almost any price for woolens? Over half his production, to be sure, during 1918 when he was making the twelve-million profit, was of cloth for army and navy uniforms. But it was the government's privilege to set the price. It is absurd, too, for one arm of the government to give him his profit, and then for another arm to accuse him of crime for charging about the same rate to the public.

That brings us to Mr. Wood's real grievance. "The willingness or ability of the consuming public to keep on purchasing goods at present, or even slightly lower, prices is beginning to be doubted by some of the leading retailers of the country," writes the *Standard Daily Trade Service*. Retailers therefore are not ordering. The men's clothing manufacturers who use the cheaper grades of woolens—which the American Woolen Company makes—are canceling their orders without mercy, shifting their responsibility back upon the mills. Mr. Wood might, if he wished, go on making staple goods in advance of demand, at the risk of some loss. That is ordinarily done in such cases to save the cost of idle plants. But in this case Mr. Wood prefers not to accept the risks of the market. He has a big enough cash surplus so that he can take the certain loss of shutting down and pass it on later to the public, instead of gambling on the uncertain loss of keeping open. "The high cost of new construction and equipment," writes a broker in a recent circular, "will in itself tend to restrict textile expansion; and with the mills having practically no goods on hand, and making due allowance for any possible slackening of activities, we cannot see how the mills can fail to enjoy prosperity for several years to come." Shutting down will have the effect of creating a shortage and boosting prices when the demand rises again. That will teach the public a lesson. "I don't see why people are kicking at high prices," Mr. Wood is reported to have said not long ago. "Aren't they getting 100 to 125 per cent higher wages than they used to get?" The people should not stop buying, thinks Mr. Wood. The government should stop talking about profiteering. The manufacturers should stop canceling their orders. He will prove to them all that it does no good. That, in substance, is Mr. Wood's grievance.

Why should anyone expect him to take the alternative course of lowering prices enough so that people will buy? He doesn't have to. He is not in business to supply the goods people need. He is not there to give jobs to workers. He is there to make money for his stockholders. He tries to be nice about it, but he is sensible enough to stick to the point. We ought to stop whining about it, as long as we allow production of necessities to be controlled entirely in the interest of earnings.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When Farmers Turn Politicians

By ARTHUR WARNER

Bismarck, North Dakota

SINCE the organization in Chicago of the Farmer-Labor Party, the question has naturally been raised of the extent to which the rural population of the country would support it. Admittedly, if such support develops, it will center chiefly in the States of the Northwest where the National Nonpartisan League is organized and farmers have shown not only the desire to break away from the old parties, but have evolved a technique for doing it.

The official statement issued by the League from Minneapolis during the Farmer-Labor convention, and widely heralded as a repudiation of it, was nothing of the kind. It was merely a reaffirmation of what had been said before the convention. The League is not a party but a movement, it is concerned with state, and not with national politics, and since it works through different parties in different States, it cannot indorse any national candidate without changing its principles and practice. In each State where the Nonpartisan League is organized, it goes into the primaries of the dominant party and tries to capture them for its candidates, except in a few States where conditions have made it advisable to run an independent ticket. If, for instance, the League should indorse Harding for President, it would create no trouble in North Dakota, where the League controls the Republican organization, but it would not do in Montana, where the League is trying to capture the Democratic machine.

It is one of the possibilities of the future that the Nonpartisans will reorganize as a national political party, fusing with the newly-formed Farmer-Labor group. This will depend largely on the extent to which individual members of the League support the Christensen ticket this year. League members do not consider that their State affiliation with a given party imposes any obligation upon them individually to vote that ticket for President. In North Dakota, for instance, it is expected that Christensen and Hayes will be placed on the ballot by a petition initiated by League men—acting individually and unofficially. It is also likely that the League newspapers will boost the Farmer-Labor ticket; it will certainly draw a large vote, and may even carry the State.

But the essential fact to point out is, that in the regions of its greatest membership, the Nonpartisan League is this year engaged in State campaigns that are absorbing every ounce of its strength, and beside which the Presidential election is regarded as a sideshow. In North Dakota, the one State where the Nonpartisans are in control of the administration, the League got a jolt in the primaries, but it proposes to make up for this by a complete victory on Election Day. It is also expecting to win Wisconsin by capturing the Republican primaries on September 6—with the aid of the La Follette forces—and hopes to get Montana by carrying the Democratic primaries on August 24. In Wisconsin the League will try to nominate John J. Blaine, now attorney-general, for the governorship, and will also push a candidate for Congress against Representative Esch, whose connection with the railroad law has made him vulnerable. The League candidate for governor in Montana is B. K. Wheeler, formerly a United States district attorney, who was forced out of office because of refusal to join in the hue and cry against radicals.

The Nonpartisan League lost the recent primaries in Minnesota, but it gave the old parties so close a shave that they are still rubbing their chins in bewilderment. Whereas two years ago it was 50,000 votes behind in a total of about 350,000, this year it was only 8,000 votes short in a total of about 258,000. Two years ago the League carried thirty out of the State's eighty-six counties; this year it held all of its former ground and added another twenty-four counties. Although defeated on the State ticket, the Nonpartisans succeeded in winning one congressional nomination. The Rev. O. J. Kvale beat Representative Volstead, but was later disqualified by the courts under the Corrupt Practices Act owing to a suggestion during the campaign that his opponent was an atheist. While in other quarters academic discussions are going on in regard to the possibility of harmonizing the differences between farmers and city workers, so that they can cooperate politically, in Minnesota the two groups are already working together, oblivious, apparently, of the existence of any differences. City workers are organized as the Working People's Nonpartisan Political League which acts in cooperation with the farmers.

The North Dakota campaign, however, is the one that the Nonpartisan League regards as most vital, since here is a practical experiment that the organization feels must be maintained and developed. Owing partly to overconfidence and partly to what they term their "double crosses," the Nonpartisans nearly came a cropper in the recent State primary. It will be recalled that in 1918 they elected all the State officers, except the commissioner of public instruction, and gained control of both houses of the legislature. Subsequently, however, a number of officers turned against the League, notably the attorney general, the secretary of state, and the auditor. The former entered the primary against Governor Frazier and the other two contended for their present offices. Owing to the fact that these "double crosses" professed to favor the League program and to object only to its management, they won a good many farmer votes. Excepting the secretary of state, they were defeated, but on the unofficial count the Leaguers also lost their candidate for treasurer, one of the railroad commissioners, the commissioner of public instruction, and their nominee for the supreme court; besides which they fell two short of a majority in the lower house and failed to renominate more than one of their three Representatives in Congress. Governor Frazier's majority was only about 6,000—less than in 1918. On the other hand, the League was notably successful in putting across Dr. E. F. Ladd, president of the North Dakota Agricultural College, for the upper house of Congress in place of Senator Gronna. All the losers in the primaries will be nominated independently, and victory is hoped for in November.

One gets the impression here that the Nonpartisan League is 100 per cent farmer, but not one-half of one per cent hayseed. Its leaders have not floundered in the futilities that overtake so many reform parties, but have become practical politicians of a most adept sort, beating the hacks of the old parties at their own game.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Cantu in Baja California

By MARY AUSTIN

THE only item of importance in the Cantu imbroglio is the possibility of the provisional Government not being able to deal with it decisively. And the importance of that particular item is for us rather than for Cantu. Baja California was never a state, and has scarcely population enough in all its seven hundred and fifty miles of length to make a good-sized American town. Leaving out the Indians, who make a good half of the total, there are perhaps twenty-five thousand. Of these many are wastrels, refugees, and remittance men. What Sydney was once to Australia, Enseñada Todos Santos has been to Mexico. Ever since the Revolution the Territory of Baja California has been left to run itself. Cantu has been its little king, and its army is a remnant of pre-revolutionary days, made up of regulars, convicts, and such volunteers as can be brought to the colors by lack of other interest.

For life in Baja California outside of the capital and the border resort of Tia Juanna is about as exciting as solitary confinement. Imagine a backbone of nearly naked mountain, roadless, rainless, practically treeless, almost devoid of tillable land or pastures, thrust up between the Pacific swells and a windy, treacherous gulf. Its present source of wealth is in its waters, in fisheries, lobster canneries,—the native crayfish which sells as lobster—in pearl shell, and in baroque pearls, and occasional pearls of high luster. There is rumor of mineral wealth in the interior, but working conditions are such as to render this a negligible prospect for several generations. It is accessible from the mainland by water, and by a trail which is called La Jornada del Muerte—The Journey of Death.

To Mexico the Territory of Baja California is barely self-sustaining, incapable of self-development. Its international importance is considerable. As a coaling station and a naval base it has advantages that would appeal to any nation doing business in Pacific waters and the Orient. There are already some minor Japanese and Chinese concessions, and enough English capital invested there to give us thought, should Cantu succeed in detaching it from Mexico. Self-determination for small nations sounds well when the nations are not too small and sufficiently far away. But a nation of fifty thousand people, half of whom are Indians, contiguous to a rich and undefended coast, might prove a serious embarrassment to a United States bent on living up to its political professions. De la Huerta is dispatching an army of three thousand for the disciplining of Cantu. Who knows how loyal or how well equipped it is? And in any case it is necessarily very far from any base of supplies. Moreover, there is an elbow of the Imperial Valley irrigation canal bent south into Mexico which would be the point of attack for any group resolved upon creating bad feeling along the American border. It is past question that such groups exist.

Logically the peninsula of Baja California should be added to the United States. Once it could have been bought openly and honorably, and that only a few years ago. There was a time when the revolutionists saw their way to financial rehabilitation on a basis that called for nothing more than dignified, neighborly accommodation from us. Such a plan had been well received at the White House, was even in the way of consummation. Carried out as the few understood it, as no statesman in the United States did see it clearly enough to bring it to a happy conclusion, this should have led to the purchase of Baja California for a sum that would have made all the difference in the world to the Mexican treasury, and would have been inconsiderable to us, for what we would have been getting. There were at that time not above two or three thousand people in the Territory who would have been incommoded by the transfer, and those we could have generously recompensed. All at once the plan collapsed. Wall Street is reported to have breathed upon it, pocket-short in its vision as Wall Street always is.

What our financiers hoped for was to have Mexico so deeply in our debt that she would be amenable to exploitation, a situation they have not yet succeeded in bringing about. For this city sacrificed the opportunity to create a neighborly entente and equable exchange of benefits.

The one contention upon which the Mexican people would have had to be satisfied in such a purchase was as to whether the holding of the peninsula by the United States could be regarded as a menace or as a friendly bulwark. No one who understands the Mexican people doubts that it rested with us to present ourselves in one or the other light. The honorable acquirement of Baja California by the United States might with time and tact be brought within the range of possibility again. It might be brought about to put an end to the fear of Japanese concessions on the mainland, and the shared water of the Gulf might become a source of wealth to both nations. But unfortunately our jingo press and the rabid interventionists have put us in the worst possible position for dealing with Mexico over the Cantu incident. Nothing could be suggested that would not confirm the general Mexican and Latin American suspicion that our designs are predatory. There is nothing we can do that will not reverse something of our European position, or make us appear ridiculous in our international professions. In short, we are in the position toward Mexico of having talked too much and too soon. We should have made a better business of it if it had not looked to us like such good "business" to keep Mexico financially on her knees.

For the present the best that we can do is to make the most of preventing Cantu from receiving arms from any American port, and hope that other nations that have interests there, property, and resident citizens, will be too busy to avail themselves of the opportunity we have missed. In the meantime, it can not be any longer overlooked that the semi-detached position of Baja California, amid the successive revolutions of the mainland, must be a constant source of uneasiness to us. It would not be altogether bad if it caused us to revise our whole attitude toward Mexico, and to consider the political and economic pitfalls into which we may be led by a propagandized and wholly irresponsible press.

Contributors to This Issue

HENRY G. ALSBERG has been correspondent for *The Nation* in Europe for over a year.

GEORGE SOULE is an authority on industrial relations.

MARY AUSTIN, author, is a resident of California, and conversant with events along our southwestern border.

ROBERT M. LOVETT is dean and professor of English at the University of Chicago.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Trial of the Communists

By ROBERT MORSS LOVETT

THE story of the trial of the twenty members of the Communist Labor Party in Chicago goes back to the split in the Socialist Party in the summer of 1919. At that time the Communist Labor Party drew up a constitution and platform of which the outstanding features are the recognition of the principles of the Third Internationale, the abolition of the present capitalistic system of production, and the dictatorship of the proletariat in an industrial state. The means by which this program is to be realized are primarily the education and organization of the workers.

> By the term "revolutionary industrial unionism" is meant the organization of the workers into unions by industries with a revolutionary aim and purpose; that is to say, a purpose not merely to defend or strengthen the status of the workers as wage-earners, but to gain control of industry.

The party does not have much faith in political action, except "as a means of propaganda and of defense."

> The most important means of capturing state power for the worker is the action of the masses, proceeding from the place where the workers are gathered together—in the shops and factories. It is impossible to accomplish this through capitalist political machinery, but only by the exercise of their united economic power.

"Revolutionary aim," "capture of state power," "the mass action of the workers," are phrases that appear in the platform, but not one word of violence. "A sober dragging essay on political economy," it was characterized by the attorney for the defense. "No man was even moved to action by any such pamphlet. It is clear that it could have no such purpose and no such effect."

The story of the red raids initiated in wholesale fashion by the Department of Justice on New Year's Day, 1920, has been told with exact documentation by the twelve lawyers acting under the National Popular Government League [see Report upon the Illegal Practices of the United States Department of Justice], and with eloquent denunciation by Judge Anderson of Boston. One phase of the matter that has been overlooked is the example set by the Attorney General to State and municipal authorities throughout the country. In Cook County the State's Attorney, Mr. Maclay Hoyne, was not satisfied to be a follower of Mr. Palmer. In the slang of the day he "beat him to it," and there was some jealousy on the part of federal practitioners at the size of Mr. Hoyne's bag, and irritation at his lack of sportsmanship in opening his *battue* a day early. It is generally believed—in fact it was charged at the trial—that Mr. Hoyne's office was in receipt of a sum of $40,000 from private sources vaguely styled "the Chamber of Commerce" or "the State Street Stores," for the purpose of defraying the expenses of his prosecution of "the Reds." Such unwarrantable interference with the normal processes of justice gave impulse to a citizens' movement for fair play and a square deal. Although bail was fixed at exorbitant amounts, bonds were furnished generously, and when the immediate resources of the Communist Labor Party proved insufficient to secure adequate legal advice, the amount lacking was underwritten by the American Freedom Foundation and others. The defense was committed to Messrs. Clarence S. Darrow, W. S. Forrest, and W. S. Cunnea. The State's attorney's office engaged as special prosecutor Mr. Frank Comerford who, having been in or near Russia, is regarded locally as an expert on bolshevism. He was assisted by Messrs. Marvin Barnhart and Lloyd Heth.

The act under which the indictments were brought is the amendment to the treason statute, passed June 28, 1919. It recites that it is

> unlawful for a person openly to advocate the reformation or overthrow by violence, or any other unlawful means, of the representative form of government now secured to the citizens of the United States. It is unlawful to organize, or aid in the organization, or become a member of any society or association the object of which is to advocate the reformation or overthrow of the existing form of government by violence or other unlawful means;

it is unlawful to be present at a meeting of such a society, and to "display a flag or other insignia symbolizing or intended to symbolize" such change of government by violence. The whole case against the members of the Communist Labor Party depended upon constructive advocacy of "violence or other unlawful means" implied in the acceptance of the manifesto of the Third Internationale, and the approval of mass action and the general strike, as exemplified at Seattle and Winnipeg. Both the Third Internationale and the Seattle strike were mentioned in the platform of the party and about them the battle was waged.

The trial opened before Judge Oscar Hebel, of the Illinois Criminal Court, on May 10. The usual sparring for a jury followed. Nearly two months elapsed, 2,900 talesmen were summoned, and 1,359 were examined before the impartial twelve were discovered.

At the outset the judge ruled that the words and acts of the accused prior to the formation of the party would be admissible as testimony showing intent, and this let in some wild words of Mr. William Bross Lloyd. His co-conspirators apparently had been singularly discreet. The prosecution waved before the jury some posters advertising foreign journals which had been displayed in Mr. Proctor's book-store, but their bearing on the Communist Labor conspiracy to reform or overthrow the government by violence was doubtful. Another ruling by the judge practically determined the *terrain* on which the battle was fought. He allowed the Seattle strike to be aired at length, and this was almost the entire strength of the State's case. They played their trump card when the ubiquitous Ole Hanson rehearsed the familiar hero-saga, the retelling of which, as he testified, has brought him $35,000 in the last six months. The chief emphasis of his testimony was upon his own exploits; and his value to the prosecution was considerably diminished by James Duncan, the Seattle labor leader, who pictured the savior of society in a different role, not hero, but suppliant to the strike committee. "Jim, Jim, give me my lights. I don't care a damn about the street cars, but I need the lights." If the trial has no other result it has perhaps given an official quietus to a silly myth that was costing our Chambers of Commerce and Chautauquas $60,000 a year.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The emphasis on the Seattle strike was a surprise to the defence, but by good luck the conventions of the Labor Party and the Committee of Forty-Eight had brought to Chicago several witnesses besides Mr. Duncan. Mrs. Crane of the Seattle Federation of Women's Club and Mr. Swenson, who had been a member of the Central Strike Committee, both testified to the good order of the city during the labor troubles. The strike itself was shown to be a singularly unanimous example of the sympathetic walk-out, not an attempt to replace representative government by a local soviet; and the prosecution was finally driven to admit the high character of the Seattle performance.

The charge of conspiring to seek to reform or overthrow the government by violence then fell back upon the Left Wing Manifesto drawn up before the organization of the Communist Labor Party, an inflammatory speech at Milwaukee by William Bross Lloyd, delivered while Mr. Lloyd was still a Socialist, and the acceptance of the manifesto of the Third Internationale, by which mass action is recognized as leading "to direct armed conflict with governmental machinery." The State contended also that mass action was covered by the words "other unlawful means." Judge Hebel, however, in his instructions asserted that "a general strike conducted without violence is not unlawful if called to bring about by the manner prescribed (i. e., constitutionally) a reformation or overthrow of the representative form of government." That the State was seeking to throw upon the defendants the responsibility for such incidental violence as might arise from the resistance to "reformation or overthrow" by defenders of the existing order was shown by Attorney Barnhart, who challenged the jury to say whether they would accept such a social reorganization as the defendants proposed without force and violence.

The argument for the defense made by Mr. Forrest was mainly devoted to the discrepancy between the law and any overt act on the part of the defendants. Mr. Darrow took a bolder line. He justified the defendants in their purposes and methods.

> They adopted a platform which they had as much right to adopt as the Epworth League had to adopt theirs. . . . If their platform would accomplish what they hoped it would then speed the day of its adoption. . . . Is there any reason why the poor should not control industry if they can? Men have a right to carry on the industrial struggle. If the other side can't live, let them make terms. Unpractical dreamers—but we don't send men to the penitentiary for trying to help their fellow men—we send them to the insane asylum.

He made a bitter attack on the statute under which the action was brought,

> Twenty states passed laws similar to this shortly after the close of the war, moved by a common purpose and influenced by a common organization. They were passed because some one wanted them passed. We shall repent in sackcloth and ashes for the injustice we have done to men under these laws.

Mr. Darrow's pessimism was relieved by Mr. Comerford's patriotism. To him "these prophets, these historians, these martyrs, these dreamers" were merely—

> brazen, ugly, cowardly liars. Prophets, forsooth! Did Christopher Columbus venture across the seas to destroy government by force and violence? Martyrs! Did Bruno seek to destroy government by force and violence? Historians! They say the world war was a capitalists' war; they are liars. They say American labor was bribed to fight the war; they are liars.

There was much "your country and my country," of the red flag and the stars and stripes in alternate exhibition, of the Haymarket anarchists, of the assassination of McKinley, of the hypothetical assassination of Wilson, of James Duncan's solitary vote against Samuel Gompers in the American Federation of Labor Convention; much of Lincoln and Benedict Arnold, of suffering Jesus and Pontius Pilate, and the new trinity, Judas, Marx, and Lenin—of course Lenin, because, as Mr. Comerford discovered, "everywhere the footprints of the Russian Revolution are rampant in this conspiracy."

After short consideration the jury found all the defendants guilty. Seven were sentenced to the penitentiary from one to five years, and in the case of three a fine of $2,000 was added. The others were sentenced to one year in the county jail, in two cases with a fine of $1,000.

The jury apparently shared Mr. Comerford's view. As one of the jurymen stated in the *Daily News*,

> Although no evidence of overt acts was presented in this case, we were certain that had the defendants carried their revolutionary program to its logical conclusion, or had it run its course, a state of anarchy would have been brought about. There would have been confusion and chaos. The defendants would have disrupted the labor organizations.

That is to say, the verdict represented unanimous disapproval on the part of a typical American jury of the opinions of the defendants; and inability to see anything but social evil in their realization. To send them to jail as a penalty for advocating their views seems to such a jury natural and wise. Obviously, in such a state of affairs a trial of eighty-five days is pure waste of time on the part of everyone concerned. The only question at issue is how strongly the jury disapproves of the opinions of the accused, and how far the law allows it to go in marking that disapproval. The suggested procedure attributed to Secretary of State Langtry of Massachusetts is far more logical. "If I had my way I would take them (the reds) out in the yard every morning and shoot them, and the next day would have a trial to see whether or not they were guilty."

In the Driftway

THE Drifter hopes to stroll along the quais of the Seine again before the riverside poplars cast another year's catkins, but he long ago made a mighty resolve to abjure Paris after his seventieth birthday. Unless, indeed, the *crise d'essence* drives the taxis off the boulevards. For the Drifter is, frankly, afraid of Paris taxi-drivers. They are the most reckless, headlong, swervy and curvy, unaccountable and unavoidable taxi-drivers in the world. In them or out of them, Paris streets are unsafe. The Drifter never saw statistics of Paris traffic accidents, but he has seen the accidents, and he is sure the statistics must be appalling. Even the Place de la Concorde, with its tremendous open spaces where taxis sport about like water-striders on a mill-pond, is guiltless of a traffic policeman. So it was with a certain mild surprise that the Drifter read in his *Times* that the Special Deputy Police Commissioner of New York City in charge of traffic was going to Paris to study traffic problems and methods of handling traffic in that city of the Drifter's dreams. The only able managers of traffic that the Drifter ever saw in Paris are the head waiters who steer Americans through the boulevard cafes. He could not help wondering what traffic the Special Deputy Police Commissioner in charge of traffic would study.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE DRIFTER has no stomach for revolution. He likes his leisure and his books, and he likes a slow and ample meal with a volume of Anatole France propped against the cruets. His was no luxurious childhood, but his parents did endow him with tastes which, he fears, could not be gratified in a period of upset and epochal change. He is inclined to believe in the desirability of the revolution for his grandchildren, but for himself he would prefer to live in the tropics while the revolution shakes the temperate zones of this old earth. The Drifter suspects that he would feel like Bertrand Russell and Russell's intellectual friends if he went to Russia. He too has something of philosophical aloofness, and a distressing inability to lose himself in enthusiastic belief that the face of the world is being altered, either by wars or by revolutions. He also is too much the disillusioned individualist of British tradition, and too much a pacifist, to share in the Russian readiness for sacrifice on the altar of a future freedom. No, the Drifter will stay in America and relish his meals and his books, and he hopes the coal crisis will pass. If not, he will have to buy wood.

* * * * *

STILL, in this faithless age when prohibition seems to be the only crusade that fires American hearts, the spectacle of Communist faith does stir even the Drifter's chill soul. He believes in religion, and the Communists are almost the only people of his acquaintance who have it. Like Russell, he dreads it, yet he sympathizes at least as much with Romain Rolland who says:

> These men have faith.
>
> If they did not believe that their sacrifice would help and serve the entire world, they would not have immolated themselves for two years with such self-forgetfulness. This mystic revolutionary feeling, this almost religious spirit, this faith, this mystic enthusiasm, has hitherto been only too lacking in the peoples of Western Europe, particularly in the French people, whose enthusiasm has been worn down for a hundred and fifty years in all the revolutions that have been betrayed or have failed. Too often revolutionary agitation has confined itself to a craft movement for an increase in wages; but nothing great and nothing permanent can be carried to success without an intense aspiration for the common good, without the victim's passion for the future of mankind.

THE DRIFTER

To a Presidential Candidate

By SEYMOUR BARNARD

Tradition's proud protagonist, you sense
Insidious innovation's propaganda;
'Tis yours to view the progress of events
From your red rocker on the front veranda.

The issues which less seasoned minds perplex,
You meet with prompt negation, wise and weighty;
Can aught arise a populace to vex
Which was not solved in classic eighteen eighty?

Bring back the static, contemplative man,
The restful role, the acquiescence hearty;
Assuredly the key to nature's plan
Is but the proper choosing of a Party.

Some decades since, the Perfect State began,
And laws of evolution were suspended;
You knew at once the goal was reached by man,
And need for further mental effort ended.

Successive years (and fruitless ones, we know)
Are spread with real accomplishments but thinly,
And lighted only by the afterglow
Of Harrison and Morton, and McKinley.

Prometheus Bound

By MAXWELL ANDERSON

Here in the voting booth I stand
And clench my ballot in my hand;
This is my weapon in distress,
This is my shield of righteousness;
Today my stature is as great
As any Eastern potentate,
And this, my summons, proudly given,
Controls the powers of hell and heaven.
Prometheus Bound has rent his chains
And rises, looming o'er the plains;
The lightning flashes from his eyes,
Illuming all our tyrannies;
And trembling on their paper thrones
The rulers and the priestly drones
Lift arms and voices in dismay
Lest the storm wash them quite away!
So, stepping to the ballot box,
I vote for Harding or for Cox.

Correspondence

The Right to Talk Sedition

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: At present I do not want to "overthrow the government by force and violence," but sometimes I fear that the disgusting cant of its defenders will tempt me to the point where I shall not be able to maintain my pacifistic convictions.

The United States Government was established "by force and violence." It has maintained itself "by force and violence." Not only that, it has used "force and violence" against smaller and weaker nations, notably Haiti and the Philippines. By "force and violence" it took from Mexico a large part of her territory. In "the world war" it helped to destroy millions of lives and billions worth of property. "By force and violence" it has taken away the liberties of those who disagreed with it. The catalogue of its crimes, done with "force and violence" against the peace and order of protesting workers is too long to write down.

That those who are committing these present, and defending those past, deeds of violence and cruelty should now profess to be horrified and wail over "destruction of life and property," desire to kill, banish or imprison all who talk "force and violence against the government," is enough to sicken a saint.

The foundation and structure of this government provide for its overthrow "by force and violence," provided it does not do the things for which it was established. The Declaration of Independence is its foundation, the Constitution, its walls. If those who are defending and those who are attacking "our institutions" would give more study to these documents the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

discussion would be more rational. The founders of this government based it on "certain unalienable rights" and declared certain self-evident truths, as follows:

"To secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed; whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it . . . all experience hath shown, that mankind are more disposed to suffer, while evils are sufferable, than to right themselves by abolishing those forms to which they are accustomed. But when a long train of abuses and usurpations, pursuing invariably the same object, evinces a design to reduce them under absolute despotism, it is their right, it is their duty, to throw off such government, and to provide new guards for their future security."

How was this right to be made available, this duty to be performed? How were the people, as a whole, to decide whether evils were any longer sufferable? How did the framer and signers of the Declaration of Independence propose to throw off the British government? To this latter question there can be but one answer: They meant to do it "by force and violence" and they did it that way. Even a Mitchel Palmer has to admit that; and logic compels the further admission that they declared the right of those coming after them, and also the "duty" to do it in the same way, if necessary. To attempt any other interpretation is to make those men ridiculous.

As to how the people are to make up their minds that evils have become insufferable: certainly they cannot come to a wise conclusion except by full and free discussion. The builders of the Government knew that; and they knew, too, the tendency of those in authority to suppress any effort towards change. Therefore they wrote into the Constitution,

"Congress shall make no law . . . abridging freedom of speech or of the press."

Could anything be clearer, or more positive and inclusive?—"NO law abridging freedom of speech or of the press."

The crowning absurdity of those who profess to be opposed to "force and violence" is the denial of representative government. In one breath they tell us that "all changes must be made in a lawful and orderly manner, through the ballot box," and in the next they tell Congressman Berger and five duly elected New York assemblymen that they cannot take their seats, although they have been chosen therefor in the lawful, prescribed manner, through the ballot box. If that doesn't destroy the people's faith in a ballot-box remedy what would?

Please notice: I have not "advocated the overthrow of the government by force and violence" nor in any other way. But *I assert my right to do so*, notwithstanding a lot of hysterical statutes to the contrary. I have argued for this right because it is the one at present most fiercely attacked; and if that may be taken away so may all our other rights.

Denver, Colorado, July 8 CELIA BALDWIN

"Third" Party Issues

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Mr. Allen McCurdy in his article The Forty-Eighters' Position appearing in the issue of July 31, says: "The Committee of Forty-Eight failed to create a new party at Chicago. This failure was inevitable; but it was a failure which revealed more clearly than ever the need for a new party."

The "new party" to which Mr. McCurdy refers is a "liberal" party. It is a party that avoids both "reaction" and "socialism." It steers a middle course between the two old parties which represent the interests of "privilege," and the two new parties which represent the interests of the workers. The new party would deny absolutely the existence of classes. It is to be a party of Americans, individual Americans, "aiming at the welfare," as Mr. McCurdy explains it, "of all the people." Mr. McCurdy is right when he says that "the Committee of Forty-Eight failed to create a new party at Chicago." He is even more in accord with the facts when he says that "this failure was inevitable." But had Mr. McCurdy either astute political judgment, or even an academic understanding of the social and economic forces of the present day, he would have said in conclusion that "it was a failure that revealed more clearly than ever the inherent impossibility of a liberal party in America today."

The failure of the Committee of Forty-Eight to create a new party "aiming at the welfare of all the people" is the most dramatic sort of demonstration of the fact that there is no such thing as "the welfare of all the people"—and that the American masses begin to understand it. The welfare of Mr. Gary, Mr. Morgan, and the Manufacturers' Association can, by no alchemy of liberal phraseology, be converted into the welfare of the factory hand, the farmer, the clerk, and the engineer. The rent and the grocer's bill now vie with the pay envelop to drive this fact home to the average man. There are two classes in America. Their shapes become more definite with the passing of months. Their social, economic, intellectual, and political interests are not alike. They are diametrically opposed. It is the workers—hand and brain—against the owners. As the opposing ranks take shape, the issue clears. As the issue clears, to dodge it becomes more difficult—and, as the debacle of the Forty-Eighters shows, more dangerous.

New York City, August 5 EVANS CLARK

"Christensen's Convention"

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: After an absence of several weeks I have just seen in print my article on "Christensen's Convention" in the issue of July 24. This article was sent by telegraph, in order to save time, and my coeditors, with more confidence in me and the telegraph company than the facts warranted, printed it virtually as received. One slip ought to be corrected. I did not write "the essential fact of policy was the victory of radicalism over bolshevism." There was no bolshevism visible. The sentence should have read "the essential fact of policy was the victory of radicalism over liberalism."

New York, August 4 ARTHUR WARNER

Bertrand Russell Self-Revised

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In a footnote to one of his articles on Russia printed in the London *Nation*, July 24, Mr. Bertrand Russell offers the following correction to his remarks upon the health of Maxim Gorky and the state of art in Russia which were contained in the concluding paragraph of the article published in the New York *Nation*, July 31:

"Inadvertantly the last sentence of my article last week gave an impression which I did not intend, namely, that the Soviet Government is indifferent or hostile to art. This is not the case; it is more friendly to art than our own Government. What I meant to suggest was that the mental atmosphere is one in which it is difficult for art to flourish, but I did not mean that artists are ill-treated."

The correction is important. The passage in question certainly gave an impression quite the reverse of that which the author now explains he intended. One wonders whether, after further careful re-reading of his articles, Mr. Russell will not find several other equally misleading inadvertancies which he will desire to correct. A few more revisions of this sort would have made these articles totally unfit for such gleeful exploitation by the capitalist press of two continents.

New York City, August 4 KENNETH DURANT

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books

The Fruits of the Frontier

The Ordeal of Mark Twain. By Van Wyck Brooks. E. P. Dutton and Company.

THE American frontier used to be the hero in the national drama: it faced the dangers and fought the battles and endowed the settlements with the material for tales and ballads. This was in the rousing days of Fenimore Cooper. Then the frontier, under the investigations of Professor Turner, was found out to be the nation's elder brother: being first sent out from home to seek a fortune it acquired new qualities in the tough school of adversity and later taught them so thoroughly to its safer kin that the entire nation was colored with them. Mr. Van Wyck Brooks makes the frontier the villain of the story: it bred, he charges, careless thinking, loud talking, conventional living, unconcern for truth or beauty, over-concern for wealth and visble success, scorn for art, and worship of laughter. Perhaps, Mr. Brooks admits, "after the disillusionments of the present epoch, that myth [of America's manifest destiny and the glory of the frontier] will prove to have a certain beautiful residuum of truth"; but for the moment his interest is to expose the ugly side of the frontier as it is reflected in one of its most brilliant and tragic products. Mark Twain, by Mr. Brooks's record, grew up in the deadest and driest of all the frontier regions—the Middle West of the forties and fifties; he was further shaped by the noisiest of them all—the Far West of the mining-fever days; with the stigmata of these experiences upon him, he spent his remaining years in an environment—and in a personal and domestic atmosphere—which never let him outgrow the frontier. He who loved the truth had so little chance to know about it that he was always mistaking academic platitudes in metaphysics or ethics for terrific discoveries. He who loved beauty had so little chance to hear about it and the part it plays in richer human lives that he was always half afraid to do more than laugh at it, as boys laugh at love though they may be shaken by its impulses. He who might have been a great satirist contented himself with being a humorist, a mere fun-maker, an encourager of national complacency, a ridiculer of idealists as well as idlers, of poets as well as fools, of unsuccessful saints as well as unsuccessful sinners. Since nature had meant him to be so much more than he became, he could become what he did only through the repression of instincts which of course took their revenges; bitterness and pessimism were the natural penalties he paid, as a thoughtful man, for the cheerful optimism which his public expected and which he usually gave it.

This "Ordeal" is so brilliant a book and comes so near the truth in its general outlines that it seems almost an excess of seriousness to point out certain excesses of seriousness into which Mr. Brooks has been carried by his ardor for the dignity of the literary profession. But it should be pointed out that his criticism is very far from being disinterested. Mr. Brooks belongs with those writers of the Youngest America who fight all the stodgy orthodoxies with a zeal not unlike that which formerly won *them* their vested seats. In expounding the limitations of Mark Twain his critic is here meaning to do a great deal more than that. He means to bring an adequate indictment against the sort of society which discourages and represses a man of genius. What sort of man of genius? Well, that sort whose creative urge moves with the sure march of a god's, and whose brain conceives and whose hands execute as a god's might do; one who is as confident of the authenticity and authority of his vision as Joan of Arc was of her Voices; one whom no punishment can deter and no agonies deflect. Just how far such a man can be held responsible for his career Mr. Brooks does not attempt to say; but he divides the responsibility for Mark Twain's failure between the man and his frontier environment—to Mr. Brooks all America is one frontier—in a proportion which lays the blame overwhelmingly upon American society. "As we can see now," he says, "a vast unconscious conspiracy actuated all America against the creative spirit." Lacking order and art and intellectual seriousness or humility in itself, the United States could not impart them to its son. A superhuman genius might have dispensed with them in his environment. Mark Twain was not a superhuman genius. He therefore had to follow instead of leading his nation.

This is to say, in effect, that the United States is to blame for not making a better leader out of Mark Twain than it did; for not making him, in other words, in better than its own image, so he could lead the country to something better still. But is there not something indispensable, or at least something very valuable, in the fact that Mark Twain was created so nearly in the image of his age as he was? Mr. Brooks, subtle, compact, a never-languid lover of art and the intellect, is appalled at the waste of material in Mark Twain, seeing there so much gift and apparently so little of it made up into permanent form or even turned to immediate social use. A more subtle, more compact, more beauty-loving community would doubtless have done something very different by Mark Twain, and in such a community he would have done something very different with his genius. If he had been more of an artist, however, he might not have been so magnificent a document. If his age had disciplined him it might not so stupendously have released him upon the world with all his uproarious if unknit laughter, and all his great gushes of tenderness, and his thundering rages, and his profanity and obscenity and blasphemy held tolerably in check but still furnishing fuel. Perhaps it is doing an injustice to Mr. Brooks to say so, but his book does not give the impression that he has ever read Mark Twain with that robust gusto which is as truly a form of criticism as more scrupulous, more acrid examinations—the gusto which keeps Dickens alive, the mirror of a valid world, against those rational judgments which with such good arguments express their preference for Voltaire or Racine. This gusto is a precious tribute to vitality, and Mark Twain in at least half a dozen out of his twenty or so volumes continues to collect it. No larger a proportion of Voltaire has survived.

If only Mr. Brooks were willing to lay a little more stress upon the tragedy and a little less upon the guilt of his offending author and nation! It was a tragic matter for Mark Twain that he had no finer schooling and no wider and firmer horizon than he had; it was for the United States a tragic matter that it so long had to go, and, indeed, still has to go so much, without the guidance of national voices speaking knowledge and shrewdness with beauty and power. As to guilt, that is not so easy to assess. Is it after all the prime business of a nation or a period to beget men of letters? Is failure to do so as sure a sign of total failure as this book contends? If the frontier is to be judged by its influence upon Mark Twain and his development, why not credit it with some of the qualities which made him immense in his species as well as charge it with its inability and unwillingness to lift him to a different species? When all has been said about the year's most fascinating volume of American criticism, there is still to be said that it is polemic.

C. V. D.

One More Mr. Wilson

Woodrow Wilson and His Work. By W. E. Dodd. Doubleday, Page and Company.

NOBODY expects a high measure of impartiality in political biography, especially during the lifetime of the subject. Even a professor of history, writing of a great party leader in an election atmosphere, cannot expect to be taken in any other light than that of an expert partisan. Mr. Wilson's career is certainly a tempting challenge to this order of expertism, and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it is fair to admit that Mr. Dodd does his work with knowledge, skill, and an independent judgment in details, sufficient to persuade readers that his wholehearted defense of the President's war and peace conduct proceeds from a genuine conviction of its high principles. In a series of informing chapters dealing with the austere upbringing, the struggle for knowledge, and the difficult career of an academic reformer, he brings out the stubbornness of will, the large vision, and the passionate certainty which are the essentials of a practical idealist.

But all this factual information only serves to deepen our sense of mystery at the critical moments when the idealism is tested. And there are several such moments during these years of trial. Mr. Wilson is delineated as a great liberal. Now liberalism means in the first place freedom to know and to say, with the tongue or pen, not what is popular or convenient, or even what is patriotic, but what one holds to be true. A liberal will always believe that this practice is for the good of his country. But Mr. Dodd, admitting that Mr. Wilson in his repressive legislation violated the Constitution and ignored "the spirit of the older American ideals" (p. 224), condones the action, adducing first, state-necessity (the Prussian plea for invading Belgium!), and second, the evil precedent set by Lincoln in the Civil War. He actually commends Mr. Wilson for securing unconstitutional laws to cover acts which Lincoln did *illegally*! And then he adds that "To the end of the war with Germany *he insisted upon mild punishments.*" Does Mr. Dodd really count ten or twenty years' imprisonment for the utterances of sincere convictions a mild punishment?

Secondly, the record shows Mr. Wilson up to 1917 essentially a pacifist, and assailed as such. There is nothing in the external evidence to explain his swift plunge into militarism. His "too proud to fight" maxim was repeated after the Lusitania incident. There is no evidence that the people who had elected him in the previous fall because he had "kept us out" wanted to go in until Mr. Wilson made them want. Why did he? What was the rapid conversion which it is commonly supposed Mr. Wilson underwent in the winter of 1916-1917? No light is here thrown upon Mr. Wilson's abandonment of the sound principle, "only a peace between equals," now so amply justified by the disastrous sequel of a victorious peace.

Thirdly, Mr. Wilson posed as champion of democracy, and only fought to make the world safe for it. Over and over again he insisted that "we are not the enemies of the German people"—"they did not originate or desire this hideous war." Yet he set his hand to a Peace which is fatal both to safety and democracy, which treated the German people as permanent enemies, and which violated all the essentials of his Fourteen Points. Here we come to the most critical of all tests for our idealist. Mr. Dodd does his best. With great skill he marshalls the hostile forces which confronted the President in his own country, evading the issue of the President's responsibility for this hostility, and defending the appeal to party in the fall elections of 1918. He shows us Mr. Wilson, the lone idealist at Paris, deserted by his countrymen and caught in the foils of an unpreparedness which placed him at the mercy of the superior expertism of European statesmen and obliged him to discuss their drafts not only of the Peace Terms but even of the League of which he was the reputed father. He does not explain why Mr. Wilson was so unprepared for the end of hostilities. There was a widespread belief at any rate in Europe that the war would collapse in the winter of 1918.

Mr. Dodd appears more conscious of the failure of Mr. Wilson at Paris than his hero himself. But he contends that this failure was a yielding to *force majeure* and therefore inevitable and innocent. Here is the precise issue. The authority of conscience, of accepted ideals, recognizes no *force majeure*. We are shown Mr. Wilson yielding first on "Open Covenants," next on "Freedom of the Seas," and then on other points of principle, until he puts his pen to a document which has made a scrap of paper of his Fourteen Points. How could he do it? Over this crucial issue Mr. Dodd commits a grave error of omission. He does, indeed, make a passing allusion to the violation of the terms of the armistice in the terms of the peace. But he fails to bring out the central fact of the great perfidy, a fact which not one in a hundred of the people of England or America appears to know, that the Fourteen Points of Mr. Wilson were formally adopted by the Allies and offered to Germany as an inducement to surrender, and that this inducement succeeded in its object. How then could Mr. Wilson bring himself to a betrayal so peculiarly his? It was perhaps not to be expected that his biographer should grapple closely with this moral issue. But with a curious felicity he does set forth the course of conduct which a staunch idealist would have taken. "Wilson had at that time three sources of influence: he could refuse, as President of the United States, to accept the treaty when finished; he could cease approving the grants of hundreds of millions of credit to European governments; and he could announce that, in his opinion, the moral forces of the world should not approve the proposed settlement." Mr. Dodd appears to regard these three courses as alternatives, and affects to show how impossible each was.

But if our idealist had taken all three courses, the practical force of his position might have shaken even Paris and brought the greedy gamblers to their knees. Had it failed for the moment, it could hardly have worsened the terms of peace; and it would have enabled Mr. Wilson to make that appeal to "the moral forces of the world" which he can never make again. Our author sees Mr. Wilson as a man who has made a great sacrifice for the internationalism of a League of Nations. But by insisting on the incorporation of the Covenant in the Peace Terms, Mr. Wilson poisoned his offspring at its birth with the war spirit which animates the structure and the functions of this partial League of European Foreign Offices. Had Mr. Wilson had the honesty and courage to recognize that he was beaten at Paris, he would have withdrawn intact his idealist forces and lived to fight another day. Instead of which he has made the very name of idealism a term of derision.

J. A. Hobson

Far Away and Long Ago

Pic The Weapon-Maker. By George Langford. Introduction by Henry Fairfield Osborn. Boni and Liveright.
The Tour. A Story of Ancient Egypt. By Louis Couperus. Translated from the Dutch by A. Teixeira de Mattos. Dodd, Mead and Company.
The Outlaw. By Maurice Hewlett. Dodd, Mead and Company.
The Light Heart. By Maurice Hewlett. Henry Holt and Company.

THE art of fiction, though more rarely than at other periods, continues to illustrate the pageants and passions of the past. And since both anthropology and archaeology have been busy gathering new facts and opening new vistas, the novelist may proceed to a new imaginative reconstruction of history. He may begin, as Mr. Langford does, at far remoter epochs than his predecessors and bring home to the mind the vision he has drawn quite literally from stocks and stones. Mr. Langford tells a tale of a Mousterian youth who meets the Neanderthal man, forms a friendship with the Mammoth and the Woolly Rhinoceros, smokes the Cave Lion out of his lair, rediscovers the art of finishing flint weapons with a utensil of bone, and in the last scene illustrates the bearing of the length of human infancy on the process of civilization. The story is necessarily schematic, since the ascertained facts are few and Mr. Langford could dispense with none. A more troublesome fault is the author's imaginative cocksureness. A higher degree of vagueness would actually have yielded an impression of greater exactness here. The estimable sentiments of the hoofed and horned beasts are reported with a fulness that stirs the mind to resistance. But where all is dark and chaotic, much must be forgiven to the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

first imaginative explorers. It is certain that Mr. Langford's book will fruitfully awaken the interest of the young in the remote past of the race, nor will maturer minds read it without some fresh light on dim places.

Louis Couperus has turned his attention to the Egypt of the age of Tiberius. A dazzling commercial civilization had invaded the ancient land whose gigantic shrines and temples were slowly sinking back into the sands of the desert. To make clear this contrast with all it involved, Couperus describes the tour of a young Roman patrician who, strangely bereft of one he loved, goes to the oracles and the wise men of Egypt in search of knowledge and consolation. The Dutch novelist has woven into his narrative all that communicates a strong sense of the modernity of the ripe civilization of the Graeco-Roman world as it appeared at Alexandria—the great reflectors that flashed searchlights over the harbor, the *diversorium* that entertained guests from the ends of the earth, the various guide-books from which the wise Thrasyllus strove to gain a knowledge of the country in which he was traveling. And then Couperus conducts his company to Memphis, to the Pyramids, to the veiled statue of Isis at Sais, and at last to the great shrine and oasis of Ammon. Lucius the Roman seeks a mystic wisdom, and all he learns even at this "ultimate outpost" and most ancient source of human wisdom is a whispered word concerning the tragical solitariness and necessary self-dependence of man.

The art of Couperus is extraordinarily firm and certain of touch. His mind has a beautiful lucidity. This book, even more perhaps than the stories that deal with his Dutch contemporaries, exhibits his frugal ease and grace, the strength and delicacy of his execution, the conscious but always finely restrained melodic structure of his prose. It is highly to the credit of Mr. Teixeira de Mattos that the latter quality of the art of Couperus is still quite vivid in the English version. It is fortunate, too, since one must desire a wide circulation for the books of this Dutch master. We get novels of greater variety and sharpness that by their very looseness of structure and tentativeness of method are more satisfying to the mind as vicarious expressions of its troubled and immediate life. To these the grave and ordered beauty of Couperus provides an admirable complement. Not that he lacks subtlety or, even in this story of ancient Egypt, spiritual timeliness. But he is always concerned with the problem of beautiful form, with the novel as striving to achieve a harmony and perfection of its own as a finely organized and very individual expression of the artist's sense of the values of life.

Mr. Maurice Hewlett is rapidly continuing his series of Sagas retold from the Origines Islandicae. These books represent a curious change in his busy career. It is as though, within himself, there had taken place a reaction against the fevered beauty of his earlier manner and the florid medievalism of the books that made him famous. He has withdrawn to a remoter and a colder age; he has abandoned the hot, bright meadows of France and Italy for the gaunt cliffs and dark seas of Iceland and the Scandinavian coasts. And this reaction in Mr. Hewlett's mind is interesting in that it corresponds, of course, to a reaction and a change that has taken place in the larger world of literature. It is not ordinarily realized how far we have traveled from the preciosity both of vision and speech that was admired during the last decade of the nineteenth and well into the first decade of the twentieth century. Both those "roses and raptures" and those "lilies and languors" are gone. Style has become spare, stripped, athletic. Even the prose of Stevenson is now felt to be a little decorative in texture and a little too aware of its own graces. The early manner and matter of Mr. Hewlett would seem almost archaic today. We want naked reality or artistic severity. We could no longer loiter with the "Forest Lovers" or the "Madonna of the Peach Trees."

Thus Mr. Hewlett has had to seek both a new substance and a new way of expressing himself. The substance he found ready to his hand in the sagas. But he takes the bare and often sterile actions recounted in them and gives them the right background of character and passion. At times one is tempted to say to him that "it is to consider too curiously to consider so"; at other times he yields to what may be called the heroic fallacy, as in such a sentence: "He was much too interested to think of what was going to happen to him." This, of any man not in the heat of conflict but in imminent danger of cold murder, is strained and false. But generally Mr. Hewlett makes one feel that he has, indeed, discovered and laid bare the humanity out of which the craggy and laconic legends grew. His style is still, despite brave efforts, a little soft in tone and jejune in diction. It would be like the unhewn rocks of the hills; it is only like smooth boulders brought to adorn a garden.

"The Light Heart" is fanciful and slight. "The Outlaw," on the other hand, is a noble tale fully and in the main nobly told. The central character of Gisli is a great thing—a sane, strong, reasonable man, unselfish through his very reasonableness, who comes to a wild and tragic end because all the forces of his world favor the ruffian and the braggart. Mr. Hewlett has deliberately made a plain tale out of his story. But an epic or dramatic poet will be in his debt some day.

LUDWIG LEWISOHN

Books in Brief

LITERARY gleanings several decades after the death of an author rarely justify themselves, but this cannot be said of "The Function of the Poet, and Other Essays" (Houghton Mifflin) by James Russell Lowell. Why this is so will be clear to anyone who recalls how often Lowell in his collected prose confuses his best and his worst, how often a commonplace passage is followed by one memorable for extraordinary wit or insight. The present volume is full of what Mr. Brownell likes to call "good things." The first five essays were edited by Charles Eliot Norton and first printed in the *Century Magazine*. If it is a little excessive to say, with Norton, that the initial essay, The Function of the Poet, is "not unworthy to stand with Sidney's and with Shelley's Defence of Poesy," it is true that the essay presents with an eagerness typical of its period the view of poetry dominant in the first half of the nineteenth century. The poet is the "seer" among men, penetrating to the ideal by virtue of his imagination; his imagination is opposed to his "understanding" and grounded in child-like wonder ("Wonder is crude imagination"). The authentic Transcendental champagne flows through the long passage in which Lowell would remind the poet that, though the times are materialistic, the poet will not bewail the fact but sing the more ardently. "Shakespeare did not sit down and cry for the water of Helicon to turn the wheels of his little private mill at the Bankside . . . To be alive now, that is the great art and mystery." That is one of Lowell's good things, and it is true. Yet there is also truth in the nearly opposite assertion in a review of Whittier: "It is all very nice to say to our poets, 'You have sky and wood and waterfall and men and women—in short, the entire outfit of Shakespeare; Nature is the same here as elsewhere'; and when the popular lecturer says it, the popular audience gives a stir of approval. But it is all *bosh*, nevertheless. Nature is *not* the same here, and perhaps never will be, as in lands where man has mingled his being with hers for countless generations, where every field is steeped in history, every crag is ivied with legend, and the whole atmosphere of thought is hazy with the Indian summer of tradition." The volume includes reviews of Henry James, Longfellow, Howells, Poe, Thackeray, Swift, and Plutarch's Morals. Nearly all contain admirable, illuminating passages, such as that disposing neatly of Thackeray's alleged cynicism, and most of the Poe article. Throughout the book, as generally in Lowell, are paragraphs, sometimes pages, notable for their beauty, vision, wit, and eminently quotable.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IT is pathetic that Samuel Guy Inman, whose book on Mexico, based upon years of experience there, was so good that the interventionists in America brought about its suppression, should not have taken more time to check up on the tales told him by Naval and Marine officers before he wrote "Haiti and Santo Domingo" (Committee on Co-operation in Latin America). "Tell it to the Marines" means something; but to let the Marines tell it is to magnify that meaning to the last degree. Of Santo Domingo Mr. Inman says: "Mahogany, gold, petroleum, and many other riches exist in abundance. Yet some 95 per cent of the people are unable to read and write; the interior of the country is practically unknown; many country people are unable to count above four or five; disease is widespread with practically no medical attention for the poor; and in general the blessings of Christian civilization are lacking." Mahogany *is* exported. The Spaniards sought gold there two centuries and gave it up as a bad job. There is hardly enough native petroleum to run a Marine's Ford two yards. In the absence of a census or some other proof, the statement of illiteracy is incredible; there are probably fewer Dominicans unable to count "uno, dos, tres, quarto, cinco" than there are horses in Elberfeld who can. Disease and mortality are as hard to dodge as taxation; but the blessings of Christianity cannot be generally lacking, for later on Mr. Inman speaks of his courteous reception by the Most Reverend Dr. Nouel, archbishop of Santo Domingo, and, by the way, once provisional president of the republic. Mr. Inman also saw the oldest Christian church in the New World, where the bones of Columbus repose, and he discovered a colony of American Negroes who still worship according to the Methodist Discipline. "Santo Domingo is more than an island or a republic," he writes. "It is a monument, an object lesson in modern history of the ancient truth that 'Righteousness exalteth a nation' and that 'Sin is a reproach to any people.'" It is also a monument to the hypocrisy of the United States and the sins of Josephus Daniels. In Haiti Mr. Inman found that 90 per cent of the rural inhabitants are little more than animal, and that "the women seem to have no modesty," although it is Marine gossip that the Haitian women were shocked at seeing American women ride astride. On the roads he saw only women and children, which he explains by saying that many of the men have been killed off by constant revolution, and "others are afraid to venture out because they may be forced into a fresh military uprising of some kind." Of course this must be an error, since the Marines pacified the country in 1916; but it explains how old Haitians can have ten wives.

EVEN Bertrand Russell's slighting remark, that the principal advantage of an Oxford education was the use to which it might be put in delicately showing inferiors their crudity, admits that there must be something fine in the university experience, for one cannot successfully assert a superiority that is totally non-existent. The better side of the Oxford spirit appears to advantage in Sir William Osler's discussion of "The Old Humanities and the New Science" (Houghton Mifflin). In the war raging between the Greeks and the Trojans—as they are called on the Isis—both parties usually assume that the two alternatives of a classical and a scientific education are mutually exclusive. But Sir William, when asked which variety of learning he will have, makes the same bold and plain answer that little Jane returned when given her choice between pie and ice-cream. Nothing less than the whole heritage of human knowledge will satisfy this heir of all the ages. He admits that methods of learning the classics will have to be speeded up a bit; he is convinced that Greek and Latin can be taught without grammar and with nothing but a reading-knowledge in mind—that there is a way of making S. P. Q. R. mean Small Profits, Quick Returns. If anything could prove the feasibility of his plan, it is his own evident mastery of the ancient writers and of modern scientists. Nothing human and nothing humane is alien to him. He appraises the scientific value of Aristotle and Lucretius with the same sure touch which he applies to hormones and the polyembryonic hymenoptera. While he thinks that the direct value of the classics to a scientist is great for what they teach of nature, he believes their main use is as a prophylactic against the dangers of over-specialization. Specialists, he observes, "lose the sense of proportion, become hypercritical, and the smaller the field the greater the tendency to megalocephaly." On the other hand, science is of the greatest value to the average educated man, for science has been defined by Plato as "the discovery of things as they really are." The training it gives is equally applicable to the study of all problems, whether practical or abstruse. Sir William is right; we should teach everything to everybody—only first we must make of everybody a universal genius.

MENTAL tests were applied to one and three-quarters millions of American army recruits for the purpose of determining their fitness to assume degrees of responsibility ranging from labor to command. The results convinced skeptics (including the reviewer, who had opportunity for observation) of the value of such a system. A brief history and a full presentation of the method, formerly held sacrosanct under the espionage act, is published with the authorization of the War Department in "Army Mental Tests" (Holt). Before 1917, mental testing had been confined almost exclusively to the individual examination of children. To meet army needs, a group of psychologists, including Professors Yerkes and Thorndike, devised a system for the rapid classification of large numbers by means of group tests, with supplemental individual tests for the subnormal. The psychological basis of the method renders the result independent of the educational status of the subject and was put into operation in all cantonments. Its strength lies in its purely empiric character, all tests having been selected on the basis of statistical study of the reactions of different grades of intelligence. The present volume includes an interesting series of tables and diagrams proving the value of the system by a comparison of mental ratings with actual efficiency.

INDUSTRY, EMOTION AND UNREST

By Edward Thomas

A "case system" presentation of our complex social structure, showing Industry, Business, and the Middle Class in their functions and environments. $1.75

JOHN ROBINSON

PASTOR OF THE PILGRIM FATHERS
A STUDY OF HIS LIFE AND TIMES

By Walter H. Burgess

A work based upon original research, telling the story of the Pilgrims, centered about their Pastor. A distinguished commemoration of the Mayflower's historic voyage. Illustrated, $5.00

HARCOURT, BRACE & HOWE, 1 W. 47th ST. NEW YORK

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes and News

ROCK candy is made—so green youth understands—by letting long strings down into boiling sugar, which forms about them in delectable, tooth-threatening crystals. Of something this same composition we may call "The Old Farmer and his Almanac" (Harvard University Press, second impression) by George Lyman Kittredge, if that most erudite of men can endure the imputation, rare enough in his career, of being elaborately sweet. The string in this case is his thread of narrative concerning the early days of Robert B. Thomas's "Farmer's Almanack," founded in 1792; the adhering substance is a vast and curious knowledge of the customs and superstitions and wit and wisdom and travels and talk of the older New England. The fifteen years since the first impression of this book have been able to find almost no errors in it, and it stands as one of the most valuable treatises by an American antiquarian.

ALFRED A. KNOPF has issued the first four volumes of The Economic Reprints, a new Social-Economic section of the Bohn Libraries. They include "The Life of Robert Owen by Himself," the "Life and Struggles of William Lovett in his Pursuit of Bread, Knowledge, and Freedom" (two volumes), and "The Pioneers of Land Reform," including essays by Thomas Spence, William Ogilvie and Thomas Paine—all of them valuable books and attractively printed and bound. That three out of the four should be biographical leads one to wonder whether the time is not coming when the lives of heroes like Owen and Lovett will be studied at least as much as those of soldiers and statesmen. Since the Renaissance artists and scholars have had a hearing; a new age may add proletarians and proletarian leaders.

IT is a sort of artistic event that a sixth edition of "The Life of James McNeill Whistler" (Lippincott) by Mr. and Mrs. Pennell has been called for. First issued in 1908, this remarkable work naturally needed to be revised, as the new edition has been, with material regarding pictures of Whistler which have changed hands, with earlier statements fortified and fresh facts added, and with new illustrations. The authors feel that the growth of Whistlers' fame justifies their intense and steady confidence that he was "the greatest artist and most striking personality of the nineteenth century."

THERE are too many weeklies and monthlies and periodicals of various periods, and additions always seem intrusions. Yet the first five numbers of the *Bulletin of the League of Free Nations Association* have amply justified its existence. They have made available to a larger public the important discussions—of Maynard Keynes's book by Paul D. Cravath, Allyn A. Young, Alvin Johnson, and David Hunter Miller, of "Free Speech and Free Press as Factors in International Relations" by Walter Lippmann, Zechariah Chafee, Jr., and Laurence Housman, and of "The Awakening of China" by Paul S. Reinsch, Dr. P. C. Chang, and Dr. Yamei Kin—which had hitherto been available only to the limited number of people able to attend the luncheons of the League in New York; and they have published invaluable material on American imperialism in the Caribbean. The June *Bulletin* printed an important address by Jacinto Lopez on "The United States and the Nations of the Caribbean," the very moderation of which made its indictment more damning. The July *Bulletin* prints a reply by Colonel George C. Thorpe, U. S. M. C., to attacks upon American administration in Haiti and Santo Domingo, which is a revelation of the inadequacy of an honest military mind to face the problems of colonial administration.

ALFRED · A · KNOPF

220 W. 42 Street, NEW YORK

THE LIFE OF FRANCIS PLACE [1771-1854]

By Graham Wallas

"Two books of our generation have attained a peculiar distinction as pathfinders. . . . The second is Mr. Graham Wallas' *The Life of Francis Place*, which virtually started the study of the enormous mass of material still extant concerning the political and economic history of England in the first three decades of the last century. The appearance of the American edition at the present moment is very timely. The years following the Battle of Waterloo present quite ludicrous parallels between that period and the present phase of American history—the word 'radical' . . . secret plottings and corresponding secret investigations . . . two ancient political parties that had almost ceased to have any reason for a separate existence. . . The life of Place was lived at the very heart of this turmoil; Place was a (if not the) leading figure."—*The Nation.*

"He was the most disinterested reformer I ever knew," said a contemporary of Place; "valuable in council, fertile in resource, performing great labors." An intensely fascinating and romantic career, full of example and inspiration for these times, in the treatment of which Mr. Wallas' masterly and scholarly achievement has never been disputed. 415 *pages; with portrait frontispiece;* $3.50 *net.*

Economic Reprints

I. THE LIFE OF ROBERT OWEN

"Alfred A. Knopf has put students of social affairs in his debt by republishing in pocket-size volumes the autobiographies of Robert Owen and William Lovett. That of Owen covers a very eventful life, and one of the first importance in the history of socialism, labor, and cooperation, and is the expression of an unusual personality."—*N. Y. Evening Post.* With an introduction by M. Beer. 352 pages; $1.50 *net.*

II-III. THE LIFE AND STRUGGLES OF WILLIAM LOVETT

The autobiography of the leader of the Chartist movement, and author of the "people's charter." With an introduction by R. H. Tawney, author of "A History of British Socialism." Two volumes; 482 pages; $3.00 *net.*

IV. THE PIONEERS OF LAND REFORM

Three essays, with an introduction by M. Beer:—"The Right of Property in Land," by Thomas Spence; "The Nationalization of the Land," by William Ogilvie; "Agrarian Justice," by Thomas Paine; 212 pages; $1.50 *net.*

HOW THE WAR CAME

By the Earl Loreburn

". . . a scathing indictment of the practical workings of secret diplomacy."
—*New York Tribune.*

In this noteworthy volume Earl Loreburn, whose constructive idealism did so much to terminate satisfactorily the Venezuelan Boundary Arbitration in 1906, has approached the political side of the Allied-German diplomatic exchanges much as Maynard Keynes did the economic side, with the result that "How the War Came" has created somewhat of a furore on the other side. $3.00 *net.* With map.

CHECK BELOW THE BOOKS YOU WISH TO PURCHASE AND MAIL WITH REMITTANCE TO THE PUBLISHER, YOUR BOOKSELLER, OR *The Nation.*

Send me

.....copies THE LIFE OF FRANCIS PLACE ($3.50; 15c postage)

..... " ECONOMIC REPRINTS, Vols..... ($1.50 each volume; 10c postage)

..... " HOW THE WAR CAME ($3.00; 15c postage)

.....

.....

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

International Relations Section

The Russian-British Notes

THE following four notes exchanged in June and July by representatives of the British Government and the Russian Soviet Government appeared as a special dispatch from Stockholm to the London *Herald* of July 10. It is an interesting fact that on July 14 Mr. Bonar Law read in the House of Commons the texts of the notes here printed except the first and that they were thereupon published in the London *Times* of July 15.

The text of the note addressed by M. Krassin to Mr. Lloyd George on June 29 at their last interview follows:

In submitting the following reply to the declaration made by the Prime Minister and other members of the British Government at the sittings of June 7, I am constrained once more to point out the abnormal conditions in which the representatives of the Soviet Government have been placed in connection with the present negotiations.

The plenipotentiary representative of the People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs, whose presence is absolutely necessary at the negotiations in the course of which the British Government has raised purely political questions, has not been admitted, while my own telegraphic intercourse with the Soviet Government has been very imperfect. Between 25 and 30 per cent of outgoing and incoming telegrams have failed to reach their destination, and numerous telegrams have been received in a highly mutilated condition.

Nor have we succeeded up till now in organizing a courier service with any regularity, despite the promised assistance, owing to the difficulties and delays in the issue of visas by the countries through which the couriers have to pass. These circumstances not only deprive me of the possibility of promptly returning answers to questions put to me and of submitting as promptly questions on our part, but also prevent me from fully and precisely informing myself of the decision and intentions of my government.

The British Government has put forward as the main conditions of the renewal of commercial relations between Soviet Russia and Great Britain the demand for a mutual pledge to cease all propaganda and hostile acts, and for the recognition in principle by the Soviet Government of Russia's liability towards private creditors.

On the first question it is necessary to distinguish between the propaganda of communist ideas among laboring masses of the western European countries and the organizing of the working class of those countries for the final struggle against the capitalist order on the one hand, and the general direction of the foreign policy of Soviet Russia against the Entente countries, particularly Great Britain, and complicity with, or direct participation in, hostile acts directed against Great Britain in various countries of the Near and Middle East including India, on the other.

So far as the communist propaganda and interference in the political life of Great Britain are concerned, the Soviet Government is prepared to give a formal pledge not to carry on such propaganda in England either openly or secretly, and not to interfere in her internal political life, if a general agreement is reached between the two countries concerning the renewal of economic and commercial relations, and if the British Government on its part undertakes not to carry on any propaganda in Russia against the Soviet Government, provided that such undertaking does not prevent the representatives of the Soviet Government in England from issuing through the press or some other channel denials of false or deliberately perverted reports regarding the fundamental principles of the Soviet regime or incidents in the life of Soviet Russia.

As regards the general foreign policy of Soviet Russia, the Soviet Government has more than once proclaimed to the world its readiness to begin peace negotiations which alone would put an end to all hostile acts between the various states and bring about the complete restoration of peace. The Soviet Government would be perfectly willing to revise the fundamental principles of its foreign policy, and, in particular, withdraw from all participation in hostile acts directed against Great Britain, if the British Government were to give a similar undertaking.

The loyal fulfilment of this undertaking would have to be properly guaranteed by a special treaty between the two governments, to be drawn up at a special conference composed of an equal number of representatives and experts on either side without the right of objection to any members of such conference on either part. The Soviet Government would be prepared on the question of place and time of such conference to meet the wishes of the British Government in the most liberal spirit.

A considerable difficulty in the drawing up of such treaty is presented by the fact that Great Britain is a member of a military coalition, some members of which are to this day directly or indirectly in a state of war with Soviet Russia and are taking part in one way or another in hostile acts directed against her, in consequence of which an undertaking on the part of Great Britain to stop hostile acts would lose a good deal of its importance, as it could easily be paralyzed by the action of Great Britain's allies in continuing their assaults against Soviet Russia and in supporting her enemies by any and every means. It would seem, therefore, that a final settlement of this question would only be possible by the negotiations for the conclusion of a formal and definite peace.

The British Government makes it a preliminary condition for the restoration of commercial relations between the two countries that the Soviet Government recognize in principle the liabilities of the Russian state toward private creditors.

Such formation of the question obviously tends to the disadvantage of Soviet Russia, since, in consequence of the nationalization of land, factories, and works, as well as of commerce, the greater portion of the private claims on the Russian side has been transformed into state claims, and Soviet Russia, therefore, in case of an unqualified acceptance of the above claim of the British Government, would risk losing the preferential right to put forward a large number of quite incontrovertible claims of her own.

The liabilities to private persons form but a fraction of the mutual liabilities of the two countries, and there is absolutely no ground to put forward for accepting, in the order of priority, this particular fraction of the mutual liabilities. The argument that the British business world would, without such recognition, never agree to resume trade negotiations with Russia is refuted by the numerous declarations of British business men anxious to resume such relations as soon as the obstacles raised by the British Government in their way have been removed.

Such declarations frequently emanate precisely from British industrialists and business men who have claims on Russia, as these business men quite justly think that, in the absence of all possibility in the near future for ruined Russia to pay the claims of her creditors, the immediate resumption of trade relations will constitute the best and probably the only means of gaining such advantage through regular intercourse with Soviet Russia as may in the next few years more than meet such claims.

The demand to recognize private claims has for its object to protect in the first place the interests of those capitalist circles of Great Britain who have already taken full advantage, with great profit to themselves, of the war of 1914-1918 and are now trying to exploit, to perhaps still greater advantage to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

themselves, the winding up of that war. The Workers' and Peasants' Government of Soviet Russia cannot possibly recognize the interests of this particular section of the population as the most important and as deserving preferential treatment.

On the contrary, from the point of view of the Soviet Government, primary importance and urgency attach to the private claims against the Entente Powers on the part of the hundreds of thousands of widows and orphans of workers and peasants of Soviet Russia, the Ukraine, the Caucasus, and Siberia, whose kith and kin have perished from British and French bullets and shells during the so-called intervention, that is, the wholly uncalled-for interference of the Entente in the internal affairs of Russia. Russian debts toward British subjects were contracted as the result of certain agreements or undertakings entered upon in respect of such persons by the previous Government of Russia. Such agreements and undertakings toward British subjects were, however, annulled by the acts of the British Government themselves at the moment when it began war and intervention against Soviet Russia and proclaimed a blockade, having for its object to compel the Russian people, by famine and privation, to renounce the form of government which it had chosen after having overthrown the autocratic Czarist regime.

Hence the question at issue at the present moment cannot possibly be the recognition of treaties and agreements abrogated by the war, but only their restoration—an act which is only possible after the Soviet Government has been officially recognized and peace relations have been restored as the result of peace negotiations and the signing of a peace treaty.

The Soviet Government agrees to the examination of all mutual claims, including those arising from liabilities toward private British subjects, in conjunction with peace negotiations at a conference to be held on the basis of reciprocity, and to be composed of an equal number of delegates and experts without the right of objection to anyone on either side.

If the British Government regards the immediate clearing up of all misunderstandings and frictions in the domain of foreign policy and in particular the cessation of all hostile acts in the Middle and Near East, as well as the immediate settlement of material claims on the basis of reciprocity as necessary and urgent, the Soviet Government will be prepared to meet such desire halfway, but does not regard, for reasons of principle as well as on actual practical grounds, an agreement on such points possible except as the result of formal negotiations for the restoration of peace relations between the two countries.

Should the British Government be unwilling to enter into such official negotiations for the restoration of peace relations between the two countries, the immediate resumption of economic and commercial relations appears, nevertheless, possible on the following basis:

1. All controversial questions in the domain of foreign policy, as well as those relating to the participation of individual governments in coalitions, alliances, and individual enterprises of a hostile character to the other country, as well as all questions relating to the mutually material claims of governments and subjects, are to be postponed until such time as they may be settled by diplomatic methods at the peace conference.

2. The two governments immediately proclaim the resumption of economic and commercial relations, and announce the temporary suspension of the material claims of the Russian state and Russian subjects against Great Britain and the British Empire, and of British subjects against Russia, pending the settlement of the question at the peace conference.

3. The fundamental principles for the resumption of trading relations are immediately established, including:

(a) Concrete measures for the removal of mines in the Baltic and other seas, as well as other measures for the safety of navigation.

(b) An official announcement to all neutral countries about the renewal of commercial relations between Russia and Great Britain and the complete freedom of navigation from and to Russian ports.

(c) The establishment of commercial representations in the two countries on the basis of reciprocity and immunity, with the right of free sojourn, travel, communication with other countries by letter, telegram, and courier and the use of cypher.

(d) An agreement by which passports, certificates of identity, powers of attorney, protocols, agreements, and such-like documents issued or certified by the authorities of one country are recognized as valid in the other country on the basis of reciprocity.

With particular regard to Clause (c), I have the honor to add that the suggestion made by the British Prime Minister about applying to commercial representatives the principle of prior consent to their appointment on the part of the government of the other country is unacceptable to the Soviet Government, since, from the point of view of the bourgeois governments of Europe who, on principle, are opposed to the Soviet regime, every representative of the Soviet Government might be treated as persona non grata. . . .

The Soviet Government, being anxious as much as possible to meet the wishes of the British Government, will not object to the right of each government to insist upon the immediate recall of such members of the trade delegation of the other country with regard to whom an infringement of the laws of the country in which they reside, or, in particular, participation in political propaganda or interference in the internal affairs of the country, shall have been proved.

In conclusion, on behalf of the Government of the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic, I have the honor once more to bring to the notice of the British Government and the entire British people, and particularly the British laboring masses, that it is the most urgent and earnest wish of the Government of Soviet Russia and of the entire Russian people, to conclude at the earliest possible date a full and general peace, without reservation, with all the Powers who in recent years have taken part in hostile acts against her.

The text of the note, dated June 30, addressed by the British Government to M. Krassin on the eve of his departure for Russia is as follows:

The British Government has given careful consideration to the memorandum produced by M. Krassin of June 29 on the negotiations which have been proceeding since the arrival of the Russian delegation at the end of May. The British Government has during the course of these negotiations shown its sincere desire to end the isolation of Russia from the western world and to reach an agreement for the resumption of trading relations which might pave the way to a general peace.

They do not think that any useful purpose will be served at this moment by attempting a detailed reply to the Russian Trade Delegation memorandum or by entering into arguments of a recriminatory character. The negotiations have now reached a stage where it is necessary to bring them to an issue. It is not clear from M. Krassin's memorandum whether the Soviet Government really desires the restoration of trading relations or not, or what are the conditions upon which it is willing to resume them.

In order, therefore, to arrive at a definite decision, the British Government now repeats what it has declared throughout, that it is willing to make an agreement for the mutual cessation of hostilities and the resumption of trading relations with Russia, and asks for categorical replies, yes or no, as to whether Russia is prepared to enter into a trade agreement with the British Empire and other Powers on the following conditions:

1. That each party refrains from hostile action or undertakings against the other and from conducting any official propaganda, direct or indirect, against the institutions of the other party; and, more particularly, that the Soviet Government will refrain from any attempt by military action or propaganda to encourage any of the peoples of Asia in any form of hostile

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

action against British interests or the British Empire. For reasons already given, this, in the opinion of the British Government, is the fundamental condition of any trading agreement between Russia and any western Power.

Trade is only possible under conditions of peace or armistice. The British Government proposes what is tantamount to a general armistice as the condition of the resumption of trade relations, in the hope that this armistice may lead ere long to a general peace.

2. That all British subjects in Russia should be immediately permitted to return home, all Russian subjects in Great Britain or other parts of the British Empire who desire to return to Russia being similarly released.

3. That the Soviet Government, in return for a corresponding undertaking from the British Government, agrees to recognize in principle that it is liable to pay compensation to private citizens who have supplied goods or service to Russia for which they have not been paid. The British Government asks for some declaration of this kind at the present time because it believes something of this nature is essential to the effective starting of trade between the two countries.

It considers it a matter of simple justice, for instance, that where a merchant has supplied the Russian people with a thousand ploughs which have been used or are still being used by the Russian people to their own great benefit, the Russian people should admit that they ought to pay that merchant and the workmen who manufactured the ploughs for the goods and services they have rendered. Unless Soviet Russia is prepared to admit that it must deal with those with whom it now wishes to trade on some recognized principles of justice, trade on a large scale such as is desired on both sides will be found to be practically impossible. The British Government does not ask that these debts should be settled now.

It is prepared to leave the determination of Russia's liabilities under this head as well as all other questions relating to debts or claims by Great Britain on Russia or by Russia on Great Britain to be mutually settled at the negotiations of peace. But it considers it necessary that the Soviet Government should make a declaration on this point in order to give the necessary confidence to western merchants, manufacturers, and workers to embark upon manufacturing and trading operations.

4. The British Government agrees to the conditions laid down by the Soviet Government in regard to commercial facilities, communications, and so forth, provided that they are mutual and excepting that it cannot agree to surrender the right possessed by every civilized government, and which it freely accords to the Soviet Government also, to object to the entry as an official agent of any government of any person who is non grata to itself.

It asserts, however, that it has no intention of debarring any Russian on the ground of his communist opinions, provided the agents of the Russian Government comply with the normal conditions for friendly international intercourse.

The British Government now awaits a definite statement from the Soviet Government as to whether it will accept these principles as the basis of an agreement to reopen trade negotiations between Russia and the British Empire and any other Power willing to accept the same conditions. If an answer is returned in the affirmative the British Government will be willing to discuss details with any experts or representatives which Soviet Russia may nominate, except such as have already been refused.

Should, however, no affirmative reply be obtained within one week of the presentation of this note, the British Government will regard the negotiations at an end, and in view of the declared unwillingness of the Soviet Government to cease its attacks upon the British Empire will take counsel with its allies as to the measures required to deal with the situation.

The reply of the Soviet Government, signed by Chicherin, was received in London by wireless on July 8.

Complying with the desire of the British Government and with the object of arriving at an early peace between Russia and Great Britain, the Russian Soviet Government accepts the principles laid down in the Allied memorandum transmitted on July 1 by the British Government to the president of the Russian delegation, Krassin, as the basis of an agreement between Russia and Great Britain, which agreement will be the object of negotiations, which must begin without delay, between both governments.

The Soviet Government agrees that the plan proposed by the British Government will have to be considered as a state of armistice between Russia and Great Britain, and shares the British Government's expectation that this armistice will pave the way to a definite peace. At the same time the Soviet Government protests against the affirmation, contrary to the real facts, relative to the presumed attacks of Soviet Russia upon the British Empire.

The Soviet Government emphasizes once more that as to Soviet Russia in her relations with Great Britain, she desires nothing but peace, and that the absence of the same disposition on the other side was the only cause preventing it from being as yet attained.

On July 11 Lord Curzon addressed a note from Spa to M. Chicherin, demanding an armistice for the Poles.

The British Government notes the acceptance by the Russian Soviet Government of the principles laid down in its memorandum of July 1, as the basis of an agreement for the resumption of trade relations and the cessation of mutual hostilities, and it therefore agrees to continue the negotiations for a definite trade agreement as soon as the Russian delegates return.

The British Government has a further proposal to make. The Soviet Government of Russia has repeatedly declared its anxiety to make peace with all its neighbors; the British Government, which is no less anxious to restore peace throughout Europe, therefore proposes the following arrangement with this object in view:

(a) That an immediate armistice be signed between Poland and Soviet Russia whereby hostilities shall be suspended. The terms of this armistice should provide on the one hand that the Polish army shall immediately withdraw to the line provisionally laid down last year by the Peace Conference as the eastern boundary within which Poland was entitled to establish a Polish administration; this line runs approximately as follows: Grodno, Vapovka, Nemirov, Brest-Litovsk, Dorugusk, Ustilug, east of Grubeshob, Krilov, and thence west of Rawa Ruska east of Przemysl to Carpathians. North of Grodno, the line which will be held by the Lithuanians will run along the railway running from Grodno to Vilna and thence to Dvinsk.

On the other hand, the armistice should provide that the armies of Soviet Russia should stand at a distance of 50 kilometers to the east of this line; in Eastern Galicia each army will stand on the line which they occupy at the date of the signature of the armistice.

(b) That, as soon as possible thereafter, a conference sitting under the auspices of the Peace Conference, should assemble in London, to be attended by representatives of Soviet Russia, Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, and Finland, with the object of negotiating a final peace between Russia and its neighboring states.

Representatives of Eastern Galicia would also be invited to London to state their case for the purpose of this conference. Great Britain will place no restriction on the representatives which Russia may nominate, provided that they undertake while in Great Britain not to interfere in the politics or the internal affairs of the British Empire or to indulge in propaganda.

The British Government as a separate proposal suggests that an armistice should similarly be signed between the forces of Soviet Russia and General Wrangel, on the condition that General Wrangel's forces shall immediately retire to the Crimea, and that during the armistice the Isthmus be a neutral zone,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and that General Wrangel be invited to London to discuss the future of troops under his command and the refugees under his protection, but not as a member of the conference.

The British Government would be glad of an immediate reply to this telegram, for the Polish Government has asked for the intervention of the Allies, and if time is lost a situation may develop which will make the conclusion of lasting peace far more difficult in Eastern Europe; further, while the British Government has bound itself to give no assistance to Poland for any purpose hostile to Russia and to take no action itself hostile to Russia, it is also bound under the Covenant of the League of Nations to defend the integrity and independence of Poland within its legitimate ethnographic frontiers.

If, therefore, Soviet Russia, despite its repeated declarations accepting the independence of Poland, will not be content with the withdrawal of the Polish armies from Russian soil on the condition of a mutual armistice, but intends to take action hostile to Poland in its own territory, the British Government and its Allies would feel bound to assist the Polish nation to defend its existence with all the means at its disposal.

The Polish Government has declared its willingness to make peace with Soviet Russia and to initiate negotiations for an armistice on the basis of conditions set out above directly it is informed that Soviet Russia also agrees. The British Government therefore would be glad of a definite reply within a week as to whether Soviet Russia is prepared to accept the aforesaid proposal for putting an end to further unnecessary bloodshed and giving peace to Europe.*

The Polish Policy of Soviet Russia

THE Russian Soviet Government has published a Red Book containing the texts of the diplomatic notes and other documents bearing upon Russo-Polish negotiations from 1918 to the Polish offensive of April, 1920. The collection includes a preface by George Chicherin, the Soviet Foreign Minister. Part of this reads:

The Soviet Government publishes the record of its relations with Poland. It hides nothing and has nothing to hide; it does not fear the judgment of the masses; it is their expression, the translator of their will, and the representatives of their aspirations. Its diplomacy is public, emanating from the workers, and is addressed to the workers of the other peoples. Because it incarnates the will of the workers of Russia, the foreign policy of the Soviet Government keeps ever in mind the workers of the countries with which Soviet Russia has to do. Soviet diplomacy addresses itself to the masses of the other countries not only when the supreme organs of the republic publish a manifesto addressed to those workers, but also when the Soviet Government speaks to another government in documents of a purely diplomatic character. Behind this government, its real correspondent is always the working people of the state concerned. It always considers the effect of each of its steps upon the consciousness of the masses of the country with whose government it deals. Its policy is the policy of the workers, who have ever in mind their class brothers in other countries.

The policy of Soviet Russia, because it is the policy of workers who live by their own toil and not of the exploiters of others, is invariably and solely a peace policy, a policy seeking friendly settlement of all conflicts with other peoples. Soviet Russia does not impose its power, its form, or its principles upon anyone; it does not carry on the tips of its bayonets revolutionary conquests which the workers of each people must win for themselves and by their own efforts. It recognizes absolutely that each people should be master of its own destiny. From the first words on the Polish question pronounced by representatives of Soviet Russia, an unchanging course has always and invariably been followed in the political relations of the Soviet Government with Poland, a course dictated by absolute recognition of the right of Poland to free self-determination and by a rigorous effort to avoid any conflict with her.

The story of Soviet Russia's relations to Poland begins with Leon Trotzky's statement at the Conference of Brest-Litovsk on February 3, 1918 (Russian calendar), that "we recognize entirely and without restriction the independence of the Polish people and of the Polish state." This statement was tempered by reference to the German occupation of Poland, then in existence, and by the statement:

We can for the present recognize as representing Poland autonomously in the preliminary peace negotiations only representatives sanctioned by the authentic organs of the Polish people itself. . . . We cannot close our eyes to the fact that the Polish state is at present occupied by foreign troops and that the so-called Polish Government is free to act only within limits set by outside parties.

More or less desultory negotiations regarding exchange of prisoners, the invasion of the Polish Consulate at Moscow by revolutionary Polish refugees, the murder of five members of a Russian Red Cross delegation by the Polish troops guarding them, the Polish pogroms, etc., occurred for several months following the birth of the Polish Republic after the German-Allied armistice. In February, 1919, a serious effort toward peace was made. The Lithuanian and White Russian soviet republics on February 17 addressed a note to the Polish Minister of Foreign Affairs suggesting a joint commission to fix peacefully the eastern frontier of Poland. On February 18, M. Chicherin, the Russian Foreign Minister, addressed a note to the governments of the five great Entente Powers repeating this suggestion, and protesting against Entente encouragement to Polish aggression, as for instance the Allied request to Germany to permit the passage across Germany of Polish troops from France destined to fight against Soviet Russia (this note was published in *The Nation* for January 17, 1920). These notes were not answered.

Despite the movement of her armies, Poland sent a special delegate to Moscow in March, to apologize for the murder of the Russian Red Cross delegation and to settle other details. M. Chicherin, on March 24, addressed a note to the delegate, M. Wienkovski, accepting a suggestion made by a committee of the Socialist Party in Poland that the frontiers between Poland and the Soviet republics be determined by plebiscite of the workers of the regions involved, after evacuation of all foreign troops, and suggesting negotiations to that end. On April 15, M. Chicherin again addressed M. Wienkovski, this time in behalf of M. Rakovski, Prime Minister of the Ukrainian Soviet Republic, announcing that recent victories of the Soviet troops over the troops of the Ukrainian Directory made it likely that those troops would soon come into contact with Polish forces, and suggesting negotiations for peaceful settlement of the boundary question in the Ukraine. Apparently no answer was made to these communications; and on April 25 Chicherin addressed a final note to Wienkovski, as follows:

Since you sent a courier to Warsaw with questions regarding the agreement between our governments, Polish troops have attacked Vilna, the capital of the sister Soviet Republic of Lithuania, an attack which shows how the present Polish Government really regards the propositions for an agreement with the soviet republics. This fact furthermore accords with the declarations published in recent Polish newspapers, in which the responsible representatives of the Polish Government are re-

* The reply of the Soviet Government to Lord Curzon's note will be printed in the next issue of the International Relations section. EDITOR—THE NATION.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ported as rejecting any agreement with soviet governments. The disloyal character of the attack on Vilna, made by Polish troops in uniforms of the Russian Red Army, shows how the present Polish Government, when soviet governments are concerned, treats the elementary principles of international relations, indispensable basis of any agreement between governments. In leaving to Poland all responsibility for the present impossibility of agreement between our governments, and in emphasizing at the same time that, animated by a persistent desire for peace, the Workers' and Peasants' Government of the Soviet Republic is always disposed to resume discussions with the Polish Government upon cessation of hostilities against the soviet republics, I have the honor to inform you that all preparations for your departure and that of your associates who came with you will have been completed by the evening of April 27. I consider it my duty to add that despite what has happened, the Russian Soviet Government still desires as soon as possible to arrange the return of the Polish refugees still in Russia to their country, and that messages concerning the repatriation of refugees will be sent to the Polish Government direct by wireless, with the request to prepare trains for the return of the refugees to the localities agreed upon by the two governments. Receive the assurance of my profound respect.

GEORGE CHICHERIN

A note dated June 3, addressed to the Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and to the governments of the Entente, after protesting against the pogroms committed in Vilna, Lida, Pinsk, etc., in the wake of the advancing Polish armies, concluded as follows:

The Soviet Government nourishes no illusions regarding the true intentions of Messrs. Pilsudski and Paderewski. While the Soviet note of March 24, announcing readiness to discuss peace after mutual evacuation of the contested territories, was not answered, and its text even was concealed in Poland, the Polish Government and its obedient diet were frankly declaring the necessity of extending Polish frontiers to the banks of the Dvina and the Dnieper. The true interpretation to be made of its reserve regarding the voluntary alliance of the Lithuanian and White Russian peoples with Poland is illustrated by the fact that on the morrow of the overturn of the Soviet Government at Vilna the Polish authorities found themselves in open antagonism to the bourgeois Lithuanian *taryba* and finally found no solution other than the establishment in Lithuania of an open Polish dictatorship. It is perfectly clear that the leading Polish circles aim at nothing less than genuine annexations, together with an active struggle against the Russian, Lithuanian, and White Russian labor movements, buttresses of the world revolution, and in particular at the immediate and thoroughgoing restoration of the great landed estates in Lithuania and White Russia—an aim which even Kolchak's followers hesitate to admit. But if the Polish Government has thus, supported by the great Powers, decided upon war at any price against the soviet republics, the Government of the Russian Soviet Republic, while protesting categorically against the neglect in this war of the elementary guaranties generally recognized and practiced by capitalist governments, demands that the Polish authorities finally stop their unspeakable policy of systematic massacre of innocent people and of murder en masse of Socialists. The Government of the Russian Soviet Republic demands that the rights and treatment universally granted prisoners of war be assured to the soldiers and officers of the Soviet armies when made prisoners of war.

CHICHERIN

Despite the lack of diplomatic relations, agreements regarding hostages and civil prisoners were reached between representatives of Poland and of Soviet Russia at the station of Mikachevichi in early November, 1919. On December 22 M. Chicherin formally made another peace offer in the following note to the Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs:

In April of this year the Soviet Government repeatedly assured the delegate of the Polish Republic, Citizen Wienkovski, of its invariable desire to end the bloodshed between the peoples of Russia and of Poland, already tried by five years of the calamity of war, and then as always the Soviet Government considered an agreement between Poland and Russia easily attainable. When Citizen Wienkovski left Moscow, that assurance was repeated. Our peace propositions nevertheless were left unanswered, and in the months which followed, the Polish troops continued to advance in the territory of soviet republics friendly to the Russian Republic. The Soviet Government was therefore surprised to learn that on November 28 the Under-Secretary of State Skrzynski, replying to an interpellation, told the Polish Diet that the Russian Republic had never made any peace proposition to Poland, and that it menaced Poland with invasion, and was not at all disposed to an agreement corresponding to the desires of the Polish people. Desiring to avoid any misunderstanding which might hinder the prompt reestablishment of peace and friendship between the two peoples, the Soviet Government again confirms its previous assurances of its firm desire to end all conflict with Poland. The Soviet Government hereby addresses to the Polish Government a formal proposal immediately to open negotiations aiming at a firm and lasting peace between the two countries. In thus carrying out the peaceful will of the workers and peasants of Russia, the Soviet Government also realizes that its proposal corresponds as well to the clearly expressed desires of all the labor organizations of Poland, of whatever party they may be, of the various democratic organizations, and of the municipalities and other Polish public organs. Peace between Russia and Poland is a vital necessity for the development of the welfare and economic activity of the two countries. The Soviet Government is persuaded that every disagreement between them can be solved by a friendly accord which will be hailed with joy by the two peoples. It is not unknown to us that there are certain obstacles which might embarrass the Polish Government in seeking such an agreement, just as similar obstacles embarrass the other neighboring governments in the same way, but these difficulties arise not from the interests or sentiments of the Polish people, but from foreign sources in opposition to its real interest. The Soviet Government expresses the hope that the pacific will of the overwhelming majority of the Polish people and comprehension of its vital interests will win the upper hand and will make possible a cessation of hostilities which only serve foreign interests. The Russian Soviet Government therefore asks the Polish Government to indicate the place and date of negotiations, which it proposes to undertake with the purpose of a treaty of peace between the two republics.

CHICHERIN

There is no answer to this appeal in the Russian Red Book. But on January 28, 1920, a formal declaration was made by the Council of the People's Commissars of the Russian Republic to the Government and people of Poland. It read:

Poland must decide whether or not she will take a step which may for years have most disastrous consequences upon the lives of the two peoples. There is every reason to believe that the efforts of the extreme imperialists of the Entente, partisans or agents of Churchill and of Clemenceau, are at present directed to throwing Poland into an unjust, senseless, and criminal war against Soviet Russia. Conscious of its responsibility to the workers of Russia, and penetrated by a profound desire to avoid the further immense sacrifices, sufferings, and devastation which threaten the two peoples,

1. The Council of the People's Commissars declares that as the policy of the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic toward Poland arises not from accidental temporary military or diplomatic combinations, but from the unchanging principle of the right of each nation to self-determination, it has recognized and will continue to recognize always and without condition or reserve the independence and sovereignty of the Polish Republic, and it is upon this recognition, which dates from the first day of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the existence of the independent Polish state, that it bases all its relations with Poland.

2. Maintaining the last peace proposal made to Poland by the People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs on December 22, the Council of the People's Commissars, foreign to any policy of aggression, declares that the Red troops will not pass the present lines of the front in White Russia, which passes near the following points: Drissa, Disna, Polok, Borisov, Parich, the stations of Ptych and Bielokorovichi; and as regards the Ukrainian front, the Council of the People's Commissars declares in its name and in that of the provisional government of the Ukraine that the Soviet troops will not conduct military operations west of the present line, which passes near Czudnov, Piliava, Derazznia, and Bar.

3. The Council of the People's Commissars declares that the Soviet Government has concluded no treaty or agreement with Germany or with any other country, directed, directly or indirectly, against Poland, and that the character and spirit of the international policy of the Soviet power excludes the very possibility of such treaties just as it excludes any desire to profit by possible collisions between Poland and Germany or any other country in order to injure Poland's independence or to violate her territory.

4. The Council of the People's Commissars declares that there is no question, territorial, economic, or other, affecting the real interests of Poland and of Russia, which cannot be decided by pacific negotiations, concessions, and mutual agreements, as is now being done in the negotiations with Esthonia. Instructing the People's Commissariat for Foreign Affairs to obtain at the February session of the Central Pan-Russian Executive Committee solemn confirmation, on the part of the supreme organ of the republic, of the bases here indicated for Soviet policy toward Poland, the Council of the People's Commissars feels that its present categorical declaration fulfils its duty to the pacific interests of the Russian and Polish peoples, and it nourishes the firm hope of seeing all litigious questions solved by peaceful accords between Russia and Poland.

V. OULIANOV (LENIN)
President of the Council of the People's Commissars
G. CHICHERIN
People's Commissar for Foreign Affairs
L. TROTZKY
People's Commissar for War and Marine

The Pan-Russian Executive Committee made a long statement indorsing this position on February 2. On February 4 the following communication was addressed to M. Chicherin from Warsaw, marked "Very Urgent":

The Government of the Polish Republic acknowledges receipt of the wireless declaration of the Government of the Russian Soviet Republic, dated January 29, 1920. The declaration will be studied and the reply communicated to the Russian Soviet Government.

STANISLAS PATEK
Minister of Foreign Affairs

The Polish armies gave the only further reply to the Russian note. On March 3, therefore, M. Chicherin sent another note to M. Patek, the essential part of which read as follows:

The Council of the People's Commissars repeated on January 30 the peace propositions previously made by the Soviet Government to the Polish Republic, and its action was solemnly confirmed by the Central Executive Committee on February 2. The delay of the Polish Government in sending to the Soviet Government the reply announced in your telegram of February 4 unfortunately retards the moment when the Russian and Polish peoples can resume their pacific life and work. We are compelled to note with regret not only that the Polish Government has not yet decided to open the peace negotiations which we proposed, but that, contrary to what we had the right to expect, it has launched a large-scale military offensive against Ukrainian territory, menacing by this new aggression the independent Ukrainian Republic. The allied Russian and Ukrainian governments being forced by this offensive to defend that territory against this unjustified aggression, and it being therefore impossible, for strategic reasons imposed by the necessities of defense of the Ukrainian front, to hold to the line indicated in the declaration of January 30, the Soviet Government calls to the attention of the Polish Government how unfortunate a continuation of the present state of war would be to the interests of the two peoples. We repudiate as heretofore any idea of aggression against Poland, which we do not threaten, seeking only to defend ourselves and our ally the Ukrainian Republic. The Russian and Ukrainian armies will cross the line mentioned only where the necessities of defense against new aggressions of the Polish army require it, and we will abstain as strictly as hitherto from similar movements on the Russian front unless the Polish army undertakes new aggressive operations, which we hope will not be the case. The Russian Soviet Government expresses the firm hope that the Polish Government will not further delay following up the peace propositions made to it and that it will begin the negotiations to which it has already given its assent.

CHICHERIN

To this the Polish Foreign Minister replied three weeks later, March 27, in a dispatch marked "Very Urgent":

Following up the peace proposals of the Council of the People's Commissars of the Russian Soviet Republic, the Government of the Polish Republic reports that it is ready to enter into negotiations and to begin preliminary discussions with the Russian plenipotentiaries beginning April 10. The Polish Government proposes Borisov as the place for the negotiations. When the Council of the People's Commissars of the Russian Soviet Republic shall have informed the Polish Government of its decision to send plenipotentiaries at the above-mentioned date or at a later date the Polish Government will give orders to interrupt hostilities in the sector of the Borisov bridgehead 24 hours before the hour fixed for the arrival of the Russian plenipotentiaries at the intersection of the Polish trenches and the Minsk-Smolensk railway line. It will be necessary for the Council of the People's Commissars of the Russian Soviet Republic to indicate in its reply the number of members of the Russian delegation and of its auxiliary personnel so that the Polish Government may make the necessary arrangements on the spot in time.

STANISLAS PATEK

Chicherin's reply was dispatched the following day, March 28:

The Russian Soviet Government received with the greatest satisfaction the proposition made in your radiogram yesterday, to begin peace negotiations between the two governments on April 10. It sees in it a step toward the establishment of definite relations of peace and friendship between the two countries and it accepts the date of April 10 for the opening of the peace conference. The Russian Soviet Government, however, cannot conceal its astonishment that the Polish Government in its communication mentions only a temporary and local suspension of hostilities in the sector where the delegation is invited to come. For our part we see nothing to justify the continuation for a single day of bloodshed or of further sacrifices of human lives when the two parties have agreed to begin peace negotiations so soon. The Russian Soviet Government considers indispensable an immediate suspension of hostilities on the entire front where the Russian and Polish armies are opposed, and it cannot understand what military object is responsible for Poland's continuation of hostilities after the decision to convoke a peace conference immediately had been reached. We also believe that the work of this conference will be conducted more effectively in a place more appropriate to the calm of deliberations, and the Soviet Government consequently considers it necessary that the negotiations take place in a neutral state. It considers that one of the Esthonian cities would be the most appropriate place and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it is endeavoring to obtain the consent of the Esthonian Government. The Russian Government believes that under these conditions no serious obstacle can prevent the success of peace negotiations between the two governments.

To this M. Patek replied on April 1 that the Soviet Government having asked the Polish Government on indicate the place and date of negotiations, the latter had indicated the place in its message of March 27 and that "it holds to the place named."

After a profound study of the whole situation the Polish Government has come to the conclusion that it is impossible for it to accept the suggestion contained in your wireless of March 28 for an armistice on the entire front. Hostilities will be suspended on the Borisov bridgehead, not temporarily, as was said in your wireless of March 27, but throughout the peace negotiations at Borisov.

M. Chicherin replied on April 2 in a long note repeating his desire for a general armistice and declaring that the sole responsibility for further bloodshed must fall on Poland. He declared that the Russian Government could not understand why military operations should be continued; that the selection for the negotiations of Borisov, in the military zone, with war continuing on both sides of it, caused suspicions of some strategic *arrière-pensée*. If Esthonia were unsatisfactory, the Russian Government suggested Petrograd or Moscow, where the wireless station would be at the service of the Polish delegation, or Warsaw, if wireless and courier facilities would be given the Russian delegation there. The Polish reply to this suggestion, marked "Urgent," was dispatched on April 7. It declared:

The Polish Government indicated Borisov as the place for the peace conference because that region was easily accessible by railway and could easily be provided with telegraphic and wireless connections. The Polish Government declined the armistice proposition because the application of the armistice to a 1,000-kilometer front would have taken as much time as the study of the essential bases of the peace treaty.

Poland would offer guaranties of personal security and immunity of couriers. The delay of the People's Commissars in giving a definite reply to the Polish Government made necessary the postponement of the negotiations to April 17, and for this the People's Commissars were solely responsible. The Polish Government awaited a final reply, considering any further exchange of notes regarding the armistice or place of meeting useless. M. Chicherin's reply, closing the negotiations, was dated April 9:

The last communication from the Polish Government being in the nature of an ultimatum declining further discussion of the choice of Borisov, which, as you know, is inacceptable to us, we find ourselves in the tragic position of seeing the negotiations shattered on a question of locality, a fact unprecedented in the history of relations. Since the Russian Government is ready to accept any other neutral or Entente city, even London or Paris, and rejects only a city in or near the military zone because the Polish Government refuses a general armistice, the Russian Government finds only one possible way out: to turn to the Entente Powers. It considers it its duty to transmit to the Polish Government the message which it has just sent to the governments of France, Great Britain, Italy, and the United States.

This message summarized the diplomatic exchanges, and concluded:

Russia has no reason to fear war, but she longs for peace in order not to be diverted from her domestic activities and to end hostilities between the peoples of Russia and of Poland and to establish between them relations of peace, reciprocal friendship, and neighborliness. . . . The repeated decisions of the Entente Powers regarding the border states of Russia show sufficiently that those governments consider their influence upon the latter decisive, and if the present negotiations fail solely because of the stubbornness of the Polish Government in insisting upon Borisov as the only place for negotiations with Russia, it will be impossible for the governments of the Entente to avoid responsibility, since their influence evidently could have led the Polish Government to adopt a more flexible attitude in this matter.

This closes the record of Russo-Polish negotiations in the Soviet Red Book. There is a protest from the Ukrainian Prime Minister against the bombardment of Kiev by Polish airplanes preceding the capture of that city by the Poles, dated April 26; General Pilsudski's proclamation to the Ukrainian people, bearing the same date; and a manifesto of the Central Pan-Russian Executive Committee to the workers, peasants, and soldiers of Poland, dated May 5, when the tide of Polish invasion was at its height.

Just Published

No. 68. Illustrated Catalogue of

Rare Books in Beautiful Old Bindings

The DR. R. T. JUPP COLLECTION of

MSS., AUTOGRAPHS, BOOKS, etc., etc., by or relating to

CHARLES DICKENS

The Collection of Relics of the Original Dora of DAVID COPPERFIELD

BOOKS ON THE FINE ARTS, SPORT

and an extensive collection of BOOKS ON SHORTHAND

The Original MS. of an Unpublished Story by RUDYARD KIPLING, earlier in date than any of his published stories

Post free from

HENRY SOTHERAN & CO.

Booksellers to the King

43, Piccadilly, W. 1,

or, 140 Strand, W. C. 2.

Cable Address; Bookmen, London — London, England.

THREE STORIES by JACK LONDON. The Dream of Debs, a story of a general strike; The Apostate, child labor story; The Strength of the Strong, story of primitive man. The three booklets mailed for 30c. Catalog of books on sociology, economics, etc., free.
CHARLES H. KERR & CO., 347 East Ohio Street, Chicago

Story Writing Properly Taught

Expert instruction in Short-story Writing will be given by the staff of Pearson's Magazine, under the personal supervision of Frank Harris. Persons whose experience with other "courses" has been unsatisfactory, will find here a service of superior worth. Careful criticism and revision of single manuscripts also made by professional writers. Fees for either service moderate. For information address,

PEARSON'S LITERARY SERVICE, 57 Fifth Ave., New York

ALICE KAUSER DRAMATISTS' AGENT — PLAYS
ESTABLISHED 1895
1402 BROADWAY, NEW YORK
Motion Picture Department
R. L. GIFFEN, Associate Manager

From Monkey to Man, 25c.

This book written by a high authority sets down in brief and simple language the theory of evolution and tells how Man, in long ages of painful progress, came up from the Monkey.

APPEAL TO REASON, GIRARD, KANSAS.

NOTICE TO FOREIGN SUBSCRIBERS

Subscribers residing in foreign countries are requested to make remittance by international money-order, or draft, payable in New York, so that subscriptions may be entered promptly.

Circulation Department THE NATION

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED